

## ABSTRACT

Title: EVOLUTION AND AMBITION IN THE CAREER OF JAN LIEVENS (1607-1674)

Lloyd DeWitt, Ph.D., 2006

Directed By: Prof. Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr.  
Department of Art History and Archaeology

The Dutch artist Jan Lievens (1607-1674) was viewed by his contemporaries as one of the most important artists of his age. Ambitious and self-confident, Lievens assimilated leading trends from Haarlem, Utrecht and Antwerp into a bold and monumental style that he refined during the late 1620s through close artistic interaction with Rembrandt van Rijn in Leiden, climaxing in a competition for a court commission. Lievens's early *Job on the Dung Heap* and *Raising of Lazarus* demonstrate his careful adaptation of style and iconography to both theological and political conditions of his time. This much-discussed phase of Lievens's life came to an end in 1631 when Rembrandt left Leiden. Around 1631-1632 Lievens was transformed by his encounter with Anthony van Dyck, and his ambition to be a court artist led him to follow Van Dyck to London in the spring of 1632. His output of independent works in London was modest and entirely connected to Van Dyck and the English court, thus Lievens almost certainly worked in Van Dyck's studio.

In 1635, Lievens moved to Antwerp and returned to history painting, executing commissions for the Jesuits, and he also broadened his artistic vocabulary by mastering

woodcut prints and landscape paintings. After a short and successful stay in Leiden in 1639, Lievens moved to Amsterdam permanently in 1644, and from 1648 until the end of his career was engaged in a string of important and prestigious civic and princely commissions in which he continued to demonstrate his aptitude for adapting to and assimilating the most current style of his day to his own somber monumentality.

Lievens's roving and acquisitive character expressed itself in his dynamic Flemish-style landscape drawings after 1660. These much-vaunted works have drawn attention away from how Lievens systematically fulfilled his ambitions as a history painter. This dissertation seeks to address the imbalanced view of Lievens's later career by examining his character and ambitions and success in light of the language his early patrons and biographers used to discuss his talent and self-confidence.

EVOLUTION AND AMBITION IN THE CAREER OF JAN LIEVENS (1607-1674)

By

Lloyd DeWitt

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
2006

Advisory Committee:

Professor Arthur K. Wheelock Jr., Chair

Professor Meredith Gill

Professor Anthony Colantuono

Professor William Pressly

Professor Philip Soergel

Professor Marjorie Venit

© Copyright by  
Lloyd DeWitt  
Doctor of Philosophy

## **Acknowledgements**

I am deeply grateful for the aid and interest of many people and institutions. First of all my thanks goes to my advisor Arthur Wheelock, for his patient support and guidance in this dissertation. The support of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation in the form of a Travel Fellowship in 2003 was crucial to my research, as was the help of the Department of Art History and Archaeology at the University of Maryland for a 2002-2003 Museum Fellowship that allowed me to work for Katie Lubber and Joe Rishel of the Department of European Painting at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. I thank them and Carl Strehlke, John Zarobell, Jennifer Thompson and Jennifer Otte Vanim for their comments, understanding, support and good cheer. Thanks also to Ernst van de Wetering, Peter Schatborn, Volker Manuth and Rudi Ekkart for their conversations and insights, and to Alfred and Isabel Bader, to whom Lievens continues to mean so much. Many thanks to Jack Horn and Craig Harbison who helped guide the earliest iterations of a Lievens project and give it great impetus and direction. My gratitude especially to Dave and Franziska, for whom Lievens has also become another family member, but above all to Christine, for her complete and unwavering support, help and love through these many years of Lievens.

## Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	ii
<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Chapter 1: Jan Lievens in Leiden, 1607-1632</b> .....	24
Lievens's parents in Leiden .....	24
The life of Jan Lievens .....	25
Lievens's siblings .....	30
Lievens's training .....	32
Joris van Schooten .....	32
Pieter Lastman .....	33
The question of training in Antwerp c. 1620 .....	38
Lievens's beginnings in Leiden .....	41
Constantijn Huygens and Lievens .....	51
A noble painter .....	58
Lievens's personality .....	63
Huygens, Orlers and Angel .....	67
Lievens's self-portraits .....	70
<i>Self-portrait in a Gorget, Profile self-portrait and Self-portrait looking right</i> .....	71
<i>Self-portrait in a Yellow Cloak</i> .....	74
Lievens's <i>tronies</i> .....	76
The origins and style of Lievens's <i>tronies</i> .....	79
Lievens's genre and Still Life Paintings of the Leiden period .....	81
<i>The Five Senses</i> .....	81
Allegory of Fire .....	82
Vanitas .....	84
<i>Boy studying Drawings</i> .....	86
History Painting .....	89
<i>Feast of Esther</i> .....	91
<i>Samson and Delilah</i> .....	93
<i>Christ on the Cross</i> .....	96
<i>Raising of Lazarus</i> .....	100
<i>Job on the Dung Heap</i> .....	106
<i>St. Peter Penitent</i> .....	109
Portraits <i>historiés</i> .....	110
" <i>Soothsayer</i> " .....	110
The Getty double Portrait .....	112
<b>Chapter 2: Lievens in England, 1632-1635</b> .....	116
Netherlandish Artists in England .....	119
Gerrit van Honthorst .....	119
Daniël Mijtens and Adriaen Hanneman .....	121
Anthony van Dyck .....	122
Lievens's works in England .....	124

Van der Doort's catalogue .....	124
<i>The King's Giant Porter</i> .....	126
Portraits on paper .....	128
"Robert South" .....	129
Jacques Gaultier .....	131
Nicolas Lanier .....	133
The Turin drawing of Charles I .....	135
The Düsseldorf portrait drawings of English Courtiers .....	138
The Drawings of London and Westminster .....	141
The fate of the English period works .....	143
Conclusion .....	144
<b>Chapter 3: Antwerp Period, 1635-1644</b> .....	146
Lievens in the Brouwer circle .....	149
History Paintings .....	152
<i>The Sacrifice of Isaac</i> .....	153
Work for the Jesuits .....	160
<i>Visitation</i> .....	160
The Problem of the <i>Holy Family</i> in Antwerp .....	162
Visit to Leiden in 1639 .....	164
Portraits in Leiden .....	165
<i>Continence of Scipio</i> .....	167
<i>The Finding of Erichthonius</i> .....	169
Horizontal Format Biblical Paintings .....	171
<i>Moses trampling the Crown of Pharaoh</i> .....	172
<i>Jacob receives Joseph's Bloody Coat</i> .....	173
<i>Pietà</i> .....	175
Genre works around 1638: <i>Dance of Death</i> .....	177
<i>Miserly Couple and Death</i> .....	178
<i>Fighting Card Players and Death</i> .....	178
Landscape paintings .....	180
Portraits of the Antwerp period .....	184
<i>Petrus Egidius de Morillon</i> .....	185
Lievens's <i>Iconographia</i> .....	186
<i>Jan Davidsz de Heem</i> .....	188
<i>Adriaen Brouwer</i> .....	188
<i>Daniel Seghers</i> .....	189
<i>Lucas Vorsterman</i> .....	190
<i>Paulus Pontius</i> .....	191
<i>Hieronymous de Bran and Thomas Howard</i> .....	192
Woodcut prints: Rubens, Jegher and Goltzius .....	193
Leaving Antwerp in 1644 .....	196
<b>Chapter 4: Amsterdam, 1644-1674</b> .....	198
From Antwerp to the <i>Oranjezaal</i> (1644-1650) .....	204
<i>Oranjezaal, The Five Muses</i> .....	205

<i>Triumph of Peace</i> .....	210
Schloß Oranienburg, in Bützow, 1653-1655 .....	212
<i>Mars and Venus</i> .....	213
<i>Diana at the Hunt</i> .....	214
Patricians and Republicans in Amsterdam: works for the new Town Hall .....	216
<i>Quintus Fabius Maxiumus dismounts before his Son</i> .....	217
<i>Brinio raised on a Shield</i> .....	221
<i>Christ and the Centurion 1657</i> .....	227
<i>Mars, 1663-1664</i> .....	229
Paintings for the Hoogheemraadschap Rijnland.....	233
Lievens's portraiture in Amsterdam .....	237
<i>London Self-Portrait and Krakow Portrait of a Young Man</i> .....	238
<i>Adriaan Trip</i> and other Amsterdam sitters for paintings .....	240
Portrait drawings.....	244
Vos and Vondel.....	246
Landscape paintings and drawings .....	251
The Final Years 1669-1674 .....	255
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	258
<b>Works Cited</b> .....	261



The dissertation document that follows has had referenced material removed in respect for the owner's copyright. A complete version of this document, which includes said referenced material, resides in the University of Maryland, College Park's library Collection.

## List of Illustrations

1. Lucas Vorsterman after Anthony van Dyck, *Portrait of Jan Lievens* (Hollstein XLIII, Nr. 174/iv), c. 1631-32.
2. Lucas Vorsterman after Anthony Van Dyck, *Portrait of Jan Lievens* (Holl. 175/i), etching, c. 1631-32.
3. Peter Paul Rubens, *Head of a Bearded Man*, c. 1618, Prince of Liechtenstein, Vienna.
4. *Head of a Bearded Man*, after Peter Paul Rubens (Sum. D 1638x), pen and brown ink drawing with brown wash, c. 1625, location unknown.
5. *Head of a Bearded Man* (Hollstein XI, 74), etching, c. 1628.
6. *Old Woman reading* (Sum. 1214), c. 1621-23, John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art.
7. *Reading Prophetess* (Sum. 1222), c. 1625, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
8. *Penitent Magdalene* (Sum. 1221), c. 1621-23, Musée de la Chartreuse, Douai.
9. *Five Senses* (Sum. 1179), c. 1623, formerly Taylor Collection, Chicago.
10. *Youth embracing a Young Woman*, c. 1623, formerly Duke of Arentburg Collection, Brussels.
11. *The Backgammon Players* (Sum. 1178), c. 1623, Spier Collection, Cape Town.
12. Rembrandt van Rijn, *The Three Singers: the Sense of Hearing* (Bredius 421), c. 1623/24, W. Baron van Dedem Collection.
13. *Pilate washing his Hands* (Sum. 1180), c. 1625, Stedelijk Museum het Lakenhal, Leiden.
14. *The Feast of Esther* (Sum. 1181), c. 1625, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh.
15. *The Feast of Esther* (Sum. D 1630x), drawing, c. 1625, Kupferstichkabinett, Dresden.
16. *The Four Evangelists: Matthew* (Sum. 1230), c. 1626-27, Residenzgalerie, Bamberg.

17. *The Caretaker of the Alsmhouse holding a Skull* (Sum. D 1595), black chalk drawing, c. 1635-40, Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.
18. “*Sultan Soliman*” (Sum. 1236), c. 1628, Sanssouci, Gemäldegalerie, Potsdam.
19. Anonymous, after Lucas Vorsterman’s engraving after Peter Paul Rubens, *Adoration of the Magi* 1617-18 (Lyon), engraving.
20. *Constantijn Huygens* (Sum. 1286), 1628-29, Musée de la Chartreuse, Douai, on loan to Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
21. *St. Paul writing to the Thessalonians* (Sum. 1240), c. 1629, Kunsthalle, Bremen.
22. *Mucius Scaevola* (Sum. D 1623x), pen and wash drawing over black chalk, c. 1625, Prentenkabinet der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden.
23. *Stoning of St. Paul* (Sum. D 1622x), pen and wash drawing over black chalk with white heightening, c. 1625, British Museum, London.
24. Jan Pietersz Berendrecht after Jan Lievens, *St. John on Patmos* (Holl. 9), etching, c. 1626.
25. Jan Joris van Vliet after Lievens, *Esau denied the Blessing* (Sum. 1182), etching, c. 1626.
26. Jan Joris van Vliet after Lievens, *Susannah and the Elders* (Sum. 1183), c. 1626.
27. *Bathsheba reading David’s Letter* (Sum. 1189), c. 1631, Cooney Collection, Studio City, CA.
28. Rembrandt van Rijn, *Musical Company* (Bredius 632), 1626, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
29. *Self-portrait in a Gorget* (Sum. 2124), c. 1626-27, location unknown.
30. *Profile Self-portrait* (Sum. 1258), c. 1627, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen.
31. *Self-portrait looking right* (Sum. 1273), c. 1631, Private Collection.
32. *Rembrandt van Rijn* (Sum. 1260), c. 1629, Cevat Collection.
33. *Self-portrait in Yellow Cloak* (Sum. 1264), c. 1631, National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh.
34. *Bearded Old Man* (Sum 1269), c. 1631, formerly Staatliche Museum, Schwerin.

35. *Bearded Old Man in profile, facing left* (Sum. 2366), c. 1636, formerly Paris.
36. *Young man Tuning a Violin*, c. 1625, Stedelijk Museum het Lakenhal, Leiden.
37. Hendrick Ter Brugghen, *Fife Player*, 1621, Staatliche Museen, Kassel.
38. *Diverse tronikens: Old Man in a Fur Cap* (Holl. 36), etching, c. 1630-32.
39. *Young man in a Gorget* (Sum. 1256), c. 1627, Gemäldegalerie, Dresden.
40. *Bust of an Old Woman* (Sum. 2360), c. 1631, Windsor Castle.
41. Frans Hals, *Mardi Gras Revelers*, c. 1616, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
42. *Allegory of Fire and Childhood* (Sum. 1216), c. 1625, Gemäldegalerie, Kassel.
43. *Capuchin Monk praying* (Sum. 1238), 1629, Monteviot.
44. *Allegory of Sight* (Sum. 1225), c. 1625, Muzeum Narodowe, Warsaw.
45. *Allegory of Smell* (Sum. 1226), c. 1625, Muzeum Narodowe, Warsaw.
46. Gerrit van Honthorst, *Soldier and a Girl*, c. 1622, Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, Braunschweig.
47. *Homo Bulla* (Sum 1215), c. 1625, Private Collection, Düsseldorf.
48. *Homo Bulla* (Sum 1227), c. 1628, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Besançon.
49. Anonymous, after Hendrick Goltzius, "*Quis Evadet*," engraving, 1594.
50. *Vanitas Still Life* (Sum. 1299), c. 1627, Hannema-De Steurs Fundatie, Heino.
51. With Jan Davidsz de Heem, *Vanitas Still Life* (Sum. 1300), c. 1627, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
52. *Boy studying Drawings* (Schneider 129), c. 1628, Musée du Louvre, Paris.
53. *St. Matthew* (Sum.1230), c. 1626-27, Residenzgalerie, Bamberg.
54. *Quill-cutter* (Sum. 1235), c. 1627, formerly Heinz Kisters Collection, Kreuzlingen.
55. *Samson and Delilah* (Sum. 1184), c. 1627-28, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

56. *Samson and Delilah* (Sum. 1185), c. 1628, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
57. Peter Paul Rubens, *Samson and Delilah*, c. 1610, National Gallery, London.
58. Jacob Matham after Peter Paul Rubens, *Samson and Delilah*, engraving, c. 1613.
59. *Christ on the Cross* (Sum. 1245), c. 1631, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Nancy.
60. Rembrandt van Rijn, *Christ on the Cross* (Bredius 543a), 1631, Church of Saint Vincent, Mas d'Agenais.
61. Paulus Pontius after Rubens, *Christ on the Cross*, engraving, 1631.
62. Otto van Veen, *Raising of Lazarus*, c. 1608, Cathedral, Ghent.
63. Peter Paul Rubens, *Raising of Lazarus*, 1618, formerly Staatliche Museen, Berlin.
64. Peter Lastman, *Raising of Lazarus*, 1622, Mauritshuis, The Hague.
65. *Raising of Lazarus* (Holl. 7), etching, c. 1630.
66. *Raising of Lazarus* (Sum. 1193), 1631, Royal Pavilion and Art Gallery, Brighton.
67. *Presentation in the Temple* (Sum. 1190), c. 1630/31, Bader Collection, Milwaukee.
68. *Job on the Dung Heap* (Sum. 1191), 1631, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa.
69. *The Penitent St. Jerome* (Sum. 1242), c. 1630/31, Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, Leiden.
70. *The Penitent St. Jerome* (Holl. 15), etching, c. 1630/31.
71. Rembrandt van Rijn, *Jeremiah lamenting the Fall of Jerusalem* (Bredius 604), 1630, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
72. Cornelis Saftleven, *Job on the Dung Heap*, 1631, Staatliche Museen, Karlsruhe.
73. “*Soothsayer*” (Sum. 1187), c. 1631, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin.
74. Gerrit van Honthorst, *Amalia van Solms*, 1631, Mauritshuis, The Hague.
75. Rembrandt van Rijn, *Amalia van Solms* (Bredius 99), 1632, Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris.

76. *Prince Karl-Ludwig von der Pfalz taught by Wolrad von Plessen as Aristotle and the Young Alexander* (Sum. 1186), 1631, J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.
77. Rembrandt workshop, *Prince Rupert of the Palatinate and his Tutor as Eli and Samuel* (Sum. 244), c. 1631, Los Angeles.
78. Gerrit van Honthorst, *Charles I and Henrietta Maria as Apollo and Diana welcoming the Muses into England*, 1628, Hampton Court Palace.
79. “*Robert South*” (Holl. 28), etching, c. 1633.
80. *Bust of an Oriental Man in front* (Holl. 36), etching, c. 1630-32.
81. *Jacques Gaultier* (Holl. 23), etching and engraving, c. 1634.
82. Lucas Vorsterman after Jan Lievens, *Nicolas Lanier* (Holl XLIII, 168), engraving, c. 1634/5.
83. Anthony van Dyck, *Nicolas Lanier*, c. 1626-28, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.
84. *Charles I* (Sum. D 1754xx), pen drawing, 1634–35, Biblioteca Reale, Turin.
85. *River God* (Sum. D 1633x), pen drawing, c. 1635-43, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.
86. *Portrait of a Man, standing* (Sum. D 1645x), black chalk drawing, 1632-35, Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf.
87. *An Aristocratic Youth in Half-length* (Sum. D 1646x), black chalk drawing, 1632-35, Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf.
88. *Aristocratic Youth* (Sum. D 1647x), black chalk drawing, c.1632-35, Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf.
89. *Man with a Cane, facing left* (Sum. D 1649x), black chalk drawing, 1632-35, formerly in London.
90. Anthony van Dyck, *James Stuart, 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Lennox and First Duke of Richmond*, black chalk drawing, c. 1635, British Museum, London.
91. *Westminster from across the Thames* (Sch. Z 166), pen and wash drawing, c.1633-34, formerly Unicorn Collection.
92. *Westminster Abbey from the north west* (Sch. Z 167), pen and wash drawing, 1633-34, Frankfurt.

93. Anthony van Dyck, *A View of Rye from the north east*, pen drawing, 1633, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.
94. Anthony van Dyck, *View of Antwerp*, pen drawing, 1632, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert 1<sup>er</sup>, Brussels.
95. *Peasant Dwelling with Haystack* (Sum. D 1686x), pen drawing, c. 1660, Seger Collection, Toronto.
96. Pieter Lastman, *Sacrifice of Isaac*, c. 1612, Museum het Rembrandthuis, Amsterdam.
97. *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (Sum. 1194), c. 1635, Galleria Doria-Pamphilj, Rome.
98. *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* (Sum. 1195), c. 1636, Castle Howard.
99. *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* (Sum. 1199), c. 1637, Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, Braunschweig.
100. *The Visitation* (Sum. 1196), c. 1638, Musée du Louvre, Paris.
101. Peter Paul Rubens, *Visitation*, left wing of *Descent from the Cross* triptych, 1612-14, Cathedral, Antwerp.
102. Peter Paul Rubens, *Ildefonso* altarpiece, 1630-32, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.
103. *The Virgin presents a Pear to the Child* (Holl. 8), etching, c. 1639.
104. *Constantijn Huygens* (Sum. D 1598), black chalk drawing, 1639, British Museum, London.
105. *Daniel Heinsius* (Holl. 22), engraving, c. 1639.
106. Early 20<sup>th</sup> century copy after *Continnence of Scipio* (Sch. 106), 1639-1641, Leiden Town Hall, destroyed 1929.
107. Anthony van Dyck, *Continnence of Scipio*, 1620-21, Christ Church, Oxford.
108. *Finding of Erichthonius* (Sum. 1202), c. 1639, formerly Kunstmuseum, Emden.
109. Peter Paul Rubens, *Finding of Erichthonius*, 1611-1617, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.
110. *Moses trampling the Crown of Pharaoh* (Sum. 1201), c. 1639, Palais des

Beaux-Arts, Lille.

111. *Jacob receives Joseph's Bloody Coat* (Sum. 1203), c. 1639-40, Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence.
112. Jan Pynas, *Jacob receives Joseph's Bloody Coat*, 1618, Hermitage, St. Petersburg.
113. *Pietà* (Sum. 1200), c. 1639, Alte Pinakothek, Munich.
114. Anthony van Dyck, *Pietà*, 1634, Alte Pinakothek, Munich.
115. *Fighting Card Players and Death* (Sum. 1197), c. 1638, Private Collection.
116. *Fighting Card Players and Death* (Holl. 19), etching, 1638.
117. *The Miserly Couple and Death* (Sum. 1198), 1638, Lady Theresa Agnew, Melbury Park.
118. Hans Holbein, "Death and the Miser," *Dance of Death*, woodcut, 1538.
119. Adriaen Brouwer, *Quarrel over a Game of Cards*, c. 1626, Mauritshuis, The Hague.
120. *Landscape with Trees and Huts by a Lake* (Sum. 1301), c. 1635, Museum der Bildende Künste, Leipzig.
121. *Dune Landscape with Trees* (Sum. 1302), c. 1635, Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam.
122. Adriaen Brouwer, *Dune Landscape under Moonlight*, c. 1635-40, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin.
123. Peter Paul Rubens, *Edge of a Forest*, c. 1620-25, Speelman Collection.
124. *Landscape with Pollard Willows* (Sum. 1303), c. 1640, Lugt Collection, Paris.
125. *Landscape with Pollard Willows* (Sum. 1304), c. 1640, Bader Collection, Milwaukee.
126. Peter Paul Rubens, *Landscape by Moonlight*, c. 1635-40, Courtauld Galleries, London.
127. *Evening Landscape* (Sum. 1304), c. 1639, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin.
128. *Landscape with Tobias and the Angel* (Sum. 1308), c. 1644, London, National Gallery.



129. Jan Lievens and David Teniers II, *Landscape* (Sch. 307), c. 1644, Foundation Aetas Aurea.
130. Jan Lievens and David Teniers II, *Evening Landscape* (Sch. 301), c. 1640, Duke of Westminster.
131. *David Teniers II* (Sum. D 1653x), black chalk drawing, 1635-44, Staatliche Museen, Konstanz.
132. David Teniers II, *Family Concert on a Terrace: the artist*, c. 1641, Private Collection.
133. Jan Lievens and Jan van der Hecke, *Landscape in a Floral Cartouche* (Sum. 1308), c. 1642-44, Duke of Sutherland.
134. *Petrus Egidius de Morillon* (Sum. 1288), Budapest, 1637.
135. *Jan Davidsz de Heem* (Sum. D 1652x), black chalk drawing, c. 1635, British Museum, London.
136. *Adriaen Brouwer* (Sum. D 1594), black chalk drawing, c. 1635-37, Lugt Collection, Paris.
137. Adriaen Brouwer, *The Smokers*, c. 1635, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
138. Adriaen Brouwer, *The Smokers*, detail of Jan Lievens. Lucas Vorsterman after Anthony Van Dyck, *Jan Lievens: detail* (Holl. 72/i), engraving, c. 1631-32.
139. *Bearded Old Man* (Sum. 1284), 1640, Museum of Art, New Orleans.
140. *Daniel Seghers* (Sum. D 1651x), black chalk drawing, 1635-44, British Museum, London.
141. Paulus Pontius after Jan Lievens, *Daniel Seghers* (Holl. XI, 33), engraving, 1635-44.
142. Frans van den Wijngaerde after Jan Lievens, *Lucas Vorsterman* (Holl. LV, 30), engraving, 1635-44.
143. Pieter de Jode II after Jan Lievens, *Paulus Pontius* (Holl. IX, 143), engraving, c.1640, in I. Meyssens, *Images de divers homes d'esprit sublime*, 1649. Cornelis de Bie, *De Gulden Cabinet* (Antwerp: 1661), 497.
144. *Hieronimus de Bran* (Sch. Z 49), black chalk drawing, c. 1635-43,

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco.

145. Lucas Vorsterman after Jan Lievens, *Hieronymus de Bran*, (Holl. XLIII, 136), engraving, 1635-43.
146. *Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel* (Sum. D 1607), black chalk drawing, c. 1642, Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin.
147. *Landscape with a Group of Trees* (Holl. 100), woodcut, c. 1640.
148. *Decaying Pollard Willow* (Sum. D 1700x), black chalk drawing, c. 1660, Kupferstichkabinett, Dresden.
149. *Seated Cleric* (Holl. 102), woodcut, c. 1640.
150. *Seated Cleric* (Sum. 1596), black chalk drawing, c. 1640, Museum Boymans van Beuningen, Rotterdam.
151. *Cain and Abel* (Holl. 99), woodcut, c. 1638.
152. Peter Paul Rubens, *Cain and Abel*, brush and wash drawing, c. 1608-10, Amsterdams Historisch Museum.
153. *Head of a Man* (Holl. 106), chiaroscuro woodcut, 1635-44.
154. *Adoration of the Magi* (Sum. 1205), 1644, Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Kingston.
155. Peter Paul Rubens, *Adoration of the Magi*, 1624, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp.
156. West Wall, Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
157. *Five Muses* (Sum. 1206), 1650, Oranjezaal, The Hague.
158. Cesar van Everdingen, *Four Muses*, c. 1650, Oranjezaal, The Hague.
159. Cesar van Everdingen, *Allegory of the Birth of Frederik Hendrik*, c. 1650, Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
160. *Triumph of Peace* (Sum. 1207), 1652, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
161. *Mars and Venus* (Sum. 1208), 1653, Jagdschloß Grünewald, Berlin.
162. *Diana at the Hunt* (Sum. 1209), 1654, Neues Palais, Potsdam.

163. *Mars and Venus* (Sum. 1210), c. 1654, Muzeum Narodowe, Poznań.
164. *Andries De Graeff* (Sum. D 1613), black chalk drawing, 1657, Teylers Museum, Haarlem.
165. *Johannes Wttenbogaert* (Sum. D 1604), black chalk drawing, 1650, Fodor Collection, Amsterdam.
166. *Quintus Fabius Maximus dismounting before his Son* (Sum. 1211), 1656, Royal Palace, Amsterdam.
167. *Christ and the Centurion* (Sum. 2356), 1657, Private Collection.
168. *Brinio raised on a Shield* (Sum. 1213), 1661, Royal Palace, Amsterdam.
169. Rembrandt van Rijn, *Three Crosses* (Bartsch 78/iv), etching, c. 1660-61.
170. Govaert Flinck, *Brinio raised on a Shield*, brush and wash drawing, c. 1659, Kunsthalle, Hamburg.
171. *Rembrandt van Rijn* (Sum. D. 1756xx), black chalk drawing, c. 1661, Prentenkabinet der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden.
172. Rembrandt van Rijn, *Oath of Claudius Civilis* (Benesch 1061), drawing, 1661, Graphische Sammlung, Munich.
173. *Mars* (Sum. 1247), 1664, Eerste Kamer, The Hague.
174. Pieter Serwouter after David Vinckboons, *The Christian Knight*, engraving, 1614.
175. *Mathematician* (Sum. 1248), 1666, Rijnlandshuis, Leiden.
176. *Justice receives the Corpus Juris from Time* (Sch. 112), 1669, Rijnlandshuis, Leiden.
177. *Self-portrait* (Sum. 1289), c. 1650, National Gallery, London.
178. *Adriaan Trip* (Sum. 1290), 1644, Private Collection.
179. *Anna Maria van Schurman* (Sum. 1291), 1649, London.
180. *Sir Robert Kerr* (Sum. 1294), 1654, National Portrait Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh.
181. *Jacob Junius* (Sum. 1295), c. 1655, Bader Collection, Milwaukee.

182. Titian, "*Ariosto*", c. 1510, National Gallery, London.
183. *Self-portrait* (Sum. D 1615), pen and brown ink, c. 1660, Albertina, Vienna.
184. *Portrait of a Young Man* (Sum. 1298), c. 1660-65, Wawel, Krakow.
185. Raphael, *Portrait of a Young Man*, c. 1515, formerly Krakow.
186. *Maerten Harpertsz Tromp* (Sum 1296), after 1653. *Cornelia Teding van Berckhout* (Sum. 1297), after 1653. Amsterdams Historisch Museum.
187. *René Descartes* (Sum. D 1660x), black chalk drawing, 1644-49, Groningen.
188. *Ephraim Bueno* (Holl. 20), engraving, c. 1655-66.
189. *Cornelis Dirksz Cool* (Sum. D 1603), black chalk drawing, 1649, Fodor Collection Amsterdam.
190. *Joannes Wittenbogaert* (Sum. D 1604), black chalk drawing, 1650, Fodor Collection, Amsterdam.
191. *Caspar Streso* (Sum D 1611), black chalk drawing, c. 1654-58, Lugt Collection, Paris.
192. *Joost van den Vondel* (Sum. D 1610), black chalk drawing, c. 1644-50, Private Collection, Hilversum.
193. *Joost van den Vondel* (Holl. 21), engraving, c. 1650.
194. *Jan Vos* (Sum. D 1614), black chalk drawing, c. 1662, Städelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt.
195. *Landscape with Road and Church Tower* (Sum 1309), c. 1645, P. de Boer, Amsterdam.
196. *Forest Landscape with Hagar and the Angel* (Sum. 1310), c. 1650, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen.
197. *Forest Landscape with Beggars and Ramblers* (Sum. 1311), c. 1650, National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh.
198. *Wooded Landscape with a Painter at the Easel* (Sum. D 1691x), pen drawing, c.1661, Städelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt.
199. *View of the Rhine at Arnhem* (Sch. 194), pen drawing, c. 1663, Lugt Collection, Paris.

## **Introduction**

Jan Lievens (1607-1674, fig. 1) was one of the most important artists of the Dutch Golden Age, but his broad and multi-faceted career has only been partially scrutinized. His training with Pieter Lastman (1583-1633) in Amsterdam from c.1619-c.1621 and his early career in Leiden have been inspected in great detail because of the broad interactions Lievens had with Rembrandt from c. 1623 to c. 1631, when the two lived only a few blocks away from each other, but the subsequent periods of Lievens's life in London from 1632 to 1634, Antwerp from 1635 to 1644 and the last decades spent largely in Amsterdam have not been thoroughly studied.

This dissertation will examine the full scope of Lievens's career. It will argue that, far from being a follower of Rembrandt, as has been widely perceived, Lievens was a dynamic personality and an ambitious artist who aspired to be another Peter Paul Rubens. His was a worldly, adventurous, and self-confident artistic personality, one that mirrors the spirit of the age in which he lived. Rather than settling in one place and safely refining and promoting a single personal style, Lievens willingly engaged in visual dialogue with many important Dutch and Flemish artists. Yet, the evolving character of his work indicates that as he sought to assimilate the most advanced styles and themes of his day, he also consciously altered his manner of painting to respond to the tastes of different patrons in different artistic centers. Finally, this dissertation will examine Lievens' contributions to a number of ambitious collective artistic projects at the latter stages of his career to demonstrate how these commissions fulfilled his early ambitions.

Born in Leiden in 1607, Lievens was the contemporary and friend of Rembrandt van Rijn (1606-1669). He began training with Joris van Schooten (c. 1587-c. 1653) in Leiden from the age of eight until ten, then spent two years in Amsterdam with the history painter Pieter Lastman. Lievens created history paintings and allegories throughout his career, from the early c. 1625 *Feast of Esther* (Sum. 1181, Raleigh, NC, fig. 14) to the late 1664 *Mars* (Sum. 1247, The Hague, fig. 173).<sup>1</sup> He worked in Leiden until 1632, when he moved to London and from there to Antwerp in 1635. Aside from a short trip to Leiden in 1639, he stayed in Antwerp until 1644, when he returned to Amsterdam. Lievens was based in Holland for the rest of his career.

We are unusually well informed about Lievens's early period from three notable sources: Constantijn Huygens, the Secretary to the Prince of Orange, Jan Jansz Orlers, Secretary to the city of Leiden, and the Leiden painter Philips Angel who wrote *Lof der Schilderkunst* in 1642.<sup>2</sup> Huygens's account, begun around 1629, is contained in a private autobiography intended for his children. He disparages Lievens's family and training, but in fact Lievens's Flemish émigré father was upwardly mobile and able to place his son with some of the most capable teachers available: Joris van Schooten in Leiden and Pieter Lastman in Amsterdam.<sup>3</sup> Since Jan Lievens started training at the remarkably early age of eight and was independent around 1621, and since Huygens noted that astonished collectors snapped up even his student works, a revision of the chronology of

---

<sup>1</sup> Werner Sumowski, *Gemälde der Rembrandt-Schüler* III (Landau/Pfalz: Pfälzische Verlagsanstalt, 1983). Where possible, paintings and drawings are referred to by Sumowski's numbers (Sum.-).

<sup>2</sup> Constantijn Huygens, *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huygens*, A. H. Kan, trans. (Rotterdam: Ad. Donker, 1971). Jan Jansz Orlers, *Beschrijvinge der Stadt Leyden*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. rev. (Leiden, 1641). Philips Angel, "Praise of Painting," Michael Hoyle, trans., *Simiolus* 24 (1996).

<sup>3</sup> Constantijn Huygens, "Mijn Jeugd," *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, Ruth Koenig, trans., Christiaan Vogelaar, ed., exh. cat. (Leiden: Stedelijk Museum het Lakenhal, 1991), 133.

his early work is needed. Lievens's earliest works, such as the *Old Woman reading* (Sum. 1214, c. 1621-23, Philadelphia, fig. 6) and the *Penitent Magdalene* (Sum. 1221, c. 1621-23, Douai, fig. 8), are very loosely, thickly and boldly painted works, and these date to 1621-23, not 1624-25 as they have traditionally been dated. From the beginning, Lievens freed himself from the portraiture and history painting his masters taught him and instead turned to the style and themes of Gerrit Honthorst in Utrecht, and copied Cornelis Ketel and Willem Buytewech of Haarlem.

Two bold, large-scale, multifigure compositions from the early 1620s, *Five Senses* (Sum. 1179, c. 1623, formerly Chicago, fig. 9) and *Backgammon Players* (Sum. 1178, c. 1623, Cape Town, fig. 11), likely reflect Lievens's increasing awareness of Rubens's works, widely known through reproductive prints and at least one of which was at that time in a Leiden collection. It is important to recognize, as did Huygens, that Lievens's work was independent and original. Rembrandt's first paintings show the influence of these two works, which were made prior to Rembrandt's period of study with Lastman that began in 1624. When Rembrandt returned to Leiden in 1625, his work in turn provoked in Lievens a renewed interest in Lastman's style and in history painting as evidenced in *Pilate washing his Hands* (Sum. 1180, c. 1625, Leiden, fig. 13) and *The Feast of Esther* (Sum. 1181, c. 1625, Raleigh, NC, fig. 14). Lievens retained, however, his own large figure scale and his emotionally detached and monumental style.

Beginning in the mid 1620's Lievens and Rembrandt work in an ever increasingly close symbiotic relationship, imitating the same masters and sharing similar ambitions as well as equipment, props, costumes and models. Their works show an intense dialogue that would become competitive towards the end of the decade. The *Feast of Esther* is not

only connected to Rembrandt's *Martyrdom of Stephen* (Bredius 531a, 1625, Lyon) stylistically, but also in the use of allegory.<sup>4</sup> Lievens's *Samson and Delilah* (Sum. 1184, c. 1627/8, Amsterdam, fig. 55), derived from a print after Rubens's great painting (c. 1613, fig. 58), was in turn closely followed by Rembrandt in a c. 1629 painting (Bredius 489, Berlin). These works mark the two artists' joint fascination with Rubens. At some point in 1628 Lievens and Rembrandt met Constantijn Huygens, who wrote he found Lievens a bold and highly productive artist, noting that he preferred over-life size figures, was original, dynamic and ambitious and exceptionally self-confident, all of which accords with how Lievens portrayed himself in the early 1630s (Sum. 1264, c. 1631, Edinburgh, fig. 31). If Lievens and Rembrandt shared a studio after 1625, as many have concluded based on Huygens's reference to them as a "pair," this arrangement lasted no later than 1628 when Lievens moved with his family into a larger house. After this time Rembrandt at times takes credit for Lievens's more important inventions by backdating his own works after them.

By the late 1620s Lievens's manner of painting had been rapidly evolving through his ability to assimilate different styles. Both he and Rembrandt refined a subtle and psychological use of chiaroscuro and its development can be traced in the range of self-portraits by each artist. After meeting them in 1628, Huygens wrote about Rembrandt and Lievens in his autobiography and took care to distinguish their approaches and styles. He wrote about the passions and emotions he loved in Rembrandt's painting of *Judas*

---

<sup>4</sup> Gary Schwartz, *Rembrandt, His Life, His Paintings* (London: Viking, 1984), 35-36. Horst Gerson, *Rembrandt. The complete edition of the Paintings by A. Bredius* (London: Phaidon, 1969). Bredius's catalogue numbers will be used to refer to Rembrandt's paintings.



*returning the Thirty Pieces of Silver* (Bredius 539a, 1629, Private Collection that serves as prologue to a more-or-less literal account of his meeting with Lievens.

Huygens discusses, in order, Rembrandt's *Judas*, Lievens's artistic excellence and intelligence, and then Lievens's excessive self-confidence, criticizing him at length for his hostility to criticism, and concludes that Lievens ought to concentrate on portraiture. His judgment, then, actually concerns Lievens's manner of painting rather than his personality. Lievens, however, recognized Huygens as the gatekeeper to the Stadhouder's exceptionally lucrative patronage and sought to adapt to Huygens's criticism in several ways. Through his portrait of Huygens he impressed its sitter with his keen and penetrating realism.

After meeting Huygens, Lievens and Rembrandt openly competed for the commission of a *Passion* series from the Stadhouder, honing each other's styles in parallel works on a number of themes such as *Christ on the Cross* and *The Raising of Lazarus*. Lievens's strategy in his print and painting of the latter subject (Holl. 7, c. 1630, fig. 65 and Sum. 1193, 1631, Brighton, fig. 66) was to produce an unprecedented and refined reading of the story, but in the end Rembrandt succeeded in gaining the prized and well-remunerated commission for a series on the passion of Christ while Lievens was given commissions for portraits, genre figures and *portraits historiés* such as the mysterious "*Soothsayer*."

Documents indicate that Lievens planned to travel to England in 1629 but decided against making the trip. Some time in 1631 or early 1632, however, Huygens seems to have introduced Lievens to Anthony van Dyck, who was visiting The Hague and at this point sketched Lievens's portrait for his print series known as the *Iconographia* (Holl.

XLIII, Nr. 174/iv, c. 1631-32, fig. 1). Van Dyck seems to have finally induced Lievens to go to England. Years later Lievens told Orlers his intention in travelling to England had been to see another country and its opportunities, the motivations that would underlie his increasingly adventurous and itinerant career.

The character of the works Lievens produced in England has always been an art historical mystery since none of the court portraits he mentioned to Orlers have survived. Some were, however, listed in inventories and again in the 1649 catalogue of the sales of Charles I's goods. Nevertheless, the documented works represent a meager output for a painter previously described as unstintingly industrious. Considering that Lievens, as Huygens attested, had produced few portraits in Leiden, his decision to move to England apparently without the invitation of a patron, was an exceptionally bold and ambitious venture.

Aside from the lost court portraits, Lievens's English oeuvre consists of a drawing of the King (Sum. D 1754xx, c. 1634-35, Turin, fig. 84), a few prints of court musicians (figs. 81, 82) and a certain Robert South (Holl. 88, c. 1633, fig. 79), a portrait of the King's porter (Sch. 299, lost), a number of drawings of anonymous courtiers (for example, *Portrait of a Man, standing*, Sum. D 1645x, 1632-35, Düsseldorf, fig. 86) and landscape drawings such as *Westminster from across the Thames* (Sch. Z 166, c. 1633/4, location unknown, fig. 91). All of these works point to an artist who seems to have had access to the inner circle of the court of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, probably through the intervention of Anthony van Dyck, with whom Lievens may have worked. The style of the landscape drawings, portrait prints and drawings are similar in style to those made by Van Dyck during this period in England. Lievens's c. 1639 statement to Orlers that he

painted, besides the King and his family, “many great Lords” probably refers to portraits he executed as Van Dyck’s assistant. Unfortunately, none of the names of Van Dyck’s studio assistants during this period of his career were recorded.

This level of absorption in Van Dyck’s practise is consistent with Lievens’s personality, and his painting style after he leaves England in 1635 suggests that he must have worked in Van Dyck’s studio before the Flemish artist left England for the Southern Netherlands late in 1633. Although Lievens may have been motivated to move to Antwerp by the change in leadership in the Spanish Netherlands and the opportunities this presented, in Antwerp he produced primarily large-scale religious paintings, including two for the Jesuits, but he had no court commissions. He must have converted to Catholicism at or before his marriage in 1638, around the time he painted a *Visitation* for the Brussels Jesuit church (Sum. 1196, c. 1638, Paris, fig. 100) and the *Holy Family with many Heads of Angels* for the Antwerp Jesuit church.

The monumental paintings Lievens produced in Antwerp up to 1639 were consistent with his ambitions in history painting developed early in his career. Lievens continued to be an original and dynamic artist introducing new iconography from alternative sources, for instance drawing on Flavius Josephus’s *Antiquities of the Jews* for *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* (Sum. 1195, c. 1636, Castle Howard, fig. 98). Although Lievens’s c. 1639 *Pietà* (Sum. 1200, c. 1639, Munich, fig. 113) closely followed Van Dyck’s 1634 *Pietà* for Abbé Scaglia in Brussels, Lievens transformed its iconography, focusing on the tools of the passion. His genre works, such as *The Miserly Couple and Death* (Sum. 1198, 1638, Melbury Park, fig. 117), reflect the influence of

local Antwerp artists, namely Adriaen Brouwer and Joos van Craesbeeck, two of Lievens's early friends in that city.

Lievens visited Lieden in 1639 and executed a significant commission there, *The Continnence of Scipio* (Sch. 106, 1639-1641, formerly Leiden, see fig. 106), for the new Town Hall in a classicising style. Despite this success in Leiden, Lievens returned to Antwerp for another five years, but gained no new major religious commissions in Antwerp. He instead branched into landscapes, even collaborating with David Teniers II on two remarkably free and painterly landscapes (for example, Sch. 307, c. 1644, *Foundation Aetas Aurea*, fig. 129). He also made woodcuts, both portraits and landscapes, and a number of portrait drawings of artists and collectors.

Lievens moved to the burgeoning metropolis of Amsterdam in 1644 and during the last thirty years of his career largely fulfilled many of his earlier ambitions through a string of prestigious commissions for history paintings and allegories, both princely and civic, in Germany and Holland. He constantly adapted his style and work to the demands and circumstances of the various commissions, assimilating influences, changing and experimenting in his work. The only consistent characteristic is the somber monumentality traceable throughout his oeuvre.

The first commission in Holland, obtained through Huygens's agency, was *The Five Muses* in the Oranjezaal in the Huis ten Bosch outside The Hague (Sum. 1206, 1650, The Hague, fig. 157), which Lievens carefully conceived to harmonize with neighboring works (fig. 158) by repeating figures and modifying his style. For the Stadhouder's daughter Henriette Louise, who married the Duke of Brandenburg, he painted similar allegories and *portraits historiés*. He also drew portraits of prominent burghers in

Amsterdam as well as poets and members of the intelligentsia. His *Self-portrait* in London (Sum. 1289, c. 1650, fig. 177) expresses his boundless self-confidence and self-absorption. In this work Lievens emulated Titian's so-called "*Ariosto*" (c.1510, London), a portrait in an Amsterdam collection that had earlier inspired Rembrandt. The poet Vondel compared Lievens to Titian, placing him very close to his ideal artist. Around this time, in 1654, the former English Ambassador Robert Kerr wrote to his son describing Lievens's supreme self-confidence, showing that Lievens had changed little from the young man Huygens had described decades earlier (Sum. 1294, 1654, Edinburgh, fig. 180).

In 1656, the city of Amsterdam commissioned a chimney piece from Lievens for the new Town Hall. His painting, *Quintus Fabius Maximus*, is a classicising *exemplum virtutis* that exploited Lievens's somber and grand style. Later the city commissioned the lunette-shaped *Brinio raised on a Shield* (Sum. 1213, 1661, Amsterdam, fig. 168) for the gallery of the Town Hall, a painting whose success epitomizes Lievens's good fortune. Rembrandt and Lievens apparently renewed their friendship during the 1640s as Rembrandt collected Lievens's landscape paintings and prints, such as *Evening Landscape* (Sum. 1304, c. 1639, Berlin, fig. 127), while around 1660 Lievens drew Rembrandt's portrait (Sum. D 1756xx, c. 1661, Leiden, fig. 171).

Lievens's huge *Mars* (Sum. 1247, 1664, Eerste Kamer, The Hague, fig. 173) for the new Statenzaal in The Hague was the largest and most prominently placed commissioned work of his career. In the gigantic and roving figure of war, Lievens fulfilled his artistic intentions, stated in his letter to the state pensionary Johan DeWitt, to create a "*schilderachtig*" or "artistic" image of war. Amelis van Bouchorst, Lord of

Wimmenum, Chairman of the Gecommitteerde Raden and Dike-Reeve of the Rijnland water authority in Leiden, was a key figure in this commission. Van Bouchorst became Lievens's next and last great patron, ordering two allegories for the Rijnlandshuis in Leiden that are still installed there: *Justice receiving the Corpus Juris from Time* (Sch. 113, 1669, Leiden, fig. 176) and the *Mathematician* (Sum 1248, 1666, Leiden, fig. 175), an allegory of the art of surveying. These were Lievens's last major public commissions and the tendency towards somber and stately grandeur visible in his earlier works persist in these. Medical documents indicate that Lievens's slow decline and inactivity after 1669 seem to have been related to an unidentified ailment.

During his last thirty years Lievens moved from place to place with great frequency; from Amsterdam to Berlin to The Hague, then Amsterdam, Leiden, The Hague and finally back to Amsterdam. He made many landscape drawings during the 1660s such as *Wooded Landscape with a Painter at the Easel*, (Sum. D 1691x, c. 1661, Frankfurt, fig. 19) and those made on his trip to Cleves of c. 1663. The widespread interest in the art of Van Dyck and Rubens ensured a steady market for Lievens's Flemish-style landscape drawings in Amsterdam.

The range of styles in which Lievens worked throughout his career raises the question of how artistic emulation and imitation was viewed in the seventeenth century. In the context of Lievens's "reluctance" to make portraits, Huygens noted Lievens's originality and his preference for working from the imagination rather than from life, and this is borne out by Lievens's ambitious development of a grand and bold style in the mid-1620s from sources other than those of his teachers.

The influential artist and author Karel van Mander opened his comprehensive *Schilder-boeck* of 1608 with a long didactic poem *Den Grondt der edel vry schilderconst*, in which he advised the young artist in all matters of training and comportment. In this poem he addressed the issue of imitation:

“Dit hoorend’/ o Jonghers/ treedt als den  
radden/ Den Wegh des arbeydts/ want t’eynd’ is besoeten/  
Schildert/ teyckent/ crabbelt/ wilt uw becladden/ Een deel  
Pampiers/ als die geeren veel hadden/ Steelt armen/ beenen/  
lijven/ handen/ voeten/ T’is hier niet verboden/ die willen  
moeten/ Wel Spelen Rapiamus personnage/ Wel  
ghecoockte rapen is goe pottage.”<sup>5</sup>

“Hearing this, young people, follow the path of labor like wheels, because at the end lies an attractive result. Paint, draw, scribble, go ahead and cover lots of paper. Greedily steal arms, legs, bodies, hands, feet. It is not forbidden here; those who wish to will have to play the role of Rapiamus. Well-cooked turnips make a good stew.”<sup>6</sup>

Van Mander puns on the term *rapen* (which means both “turnips” and “to seize”) to illustrate that borrowing many appropriate elements improves a painting, just as well-cooked turnips make for a good stew.<sup>7</sup> Van Mander’s words aptly apply to Orlers’s account of the eleven-year-old Lievens learning by copying Buytewech’s prints.<sup>8</sup> Philips Angel saw such borrowing or imitation as a form of praise of the artist who executed the

---

<sup>5</sup> Karel van Mander, *Den gront der edel vry schilderconst* I, Hessel Miedema, trans. (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1973), 87, in Karel van Mander, *Het Schilder-boeck* (Haarlem, 1604).

<sup>6</sup> Translation mine, based on Van Mander, *Den gront*, 86. Van Mander’s advice recalls Pliny’s account of Xeuxis devising the figure of Helen by assembling ideal parts from a number of models. Rennselaer Lee, “Ut Pictura Poesis, The Humanistic Theory of Painting,” *Art Bulletin* 22 (1940): 205.

<sup>7</sup> Walter S. Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 26-27. Van Mander, *Grondt* I, 87.

<sup>8</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

originals.<sup>9</sup> Philips Angel also elaborated on Van Mander's advice concerning "rapen," asserting that the measure of how skillfully the borrowed or imitated elements were integrated into the new work rested in their escaping detection.<sup>10</sup> Orlers was perhaps even consciously referring to Van Mander's anecdote about Hendrik Goltzius selling his own prints in the manner of Albrecht Dürer as originals by that master when he told of how Lievens's copies after Cornelis Ketel's *Democritus and Heraklitus* were similarly passed off to a German buyer as the originals. A similar anecdote was related by Giovanni Battista Agucchi (1570-1632) concerning Annibale Caracci (1560-1609) who found the copying of art equally creditable to the copying of nature, since both sought to fool the buyer.<sup>11</sup>

Van Mander's advice forms the background for Lievens's synthesis of the styles of Rubens and Honthorst and Rembrandt in his early work, then Van Dyck's style after 1632. His advice recalls that of the ancient author Quintilian about rhetoric, who recommended imitating only the most advanced models.<sup>12</sup> Lievens's borrowings of subject matter gradually became more skillful and subtle, developing from obvious *ekphraseis* and the open transformation of Rubens's model in his 1627/8 *Samson and Delilah* (Sum. 1184, Amsterdam, fig. 55) to the borrowings and emulations concealed in his most prominent late works such as *Brinio raised on a Shield and Mars*. The kind of

---

<sup>9</sup> Miedema, in Van Mander, *Grondt* II, 389.

<sup>10</sup> Angel, 36. Miedema, in Van Mander, *Grondt* II, 389.

<sup>11</sup> Jeffrey M. Muller, "Rubens's Theory and the Practice of Imitation," *Art Bulletin* 64 (1982): 238.

<sup>12</sup> Muller, 231.



artistic dialogue Lievens establishes with other masters involved emulation, the highest and most difficult form of imitation as defined by Quintilian.<sup>13</sup>

While Lievens is often accused of too closely copying the styles of other artists, in fact his practice engaged the most current rhetorical and artistic notions of imitation of his day, notions that he could have learned from his brothers, from his own (still unspecified) experience at the Latin Academy, from reading Van Mander, and above all from Huygens, who practiced similar forms of imitation in his poetry.<sup>14</sup> Imitation was also an important aspect of Lievens's artistic identity as distinct from Lastman (who he initially did not imitate) and his working relationship with Rembrandt from the late 1620s to the early 1630s.

Most recent scholarship has been focused on this intense yet puzzling artistic relationship between Rembrandt van Rijn and Jan Lievens, which lasted from about 1623 until Rembrandt left for Amsterdam in 1631. It was a relationship that involved cooperation as well as competition. During these years the two artists took up similar subjects, exchanged equipment and models and effected the dynamic changes in style and composition evident in each other's works. This relationship formed a significant part of the monographic exhibitions *Rembrandt, the Master and his workshop* in Berlin, London and Amsterdam in 1991. It formed the focus of *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden* in 1992, and more recently *The Mystery of the Young Rembrandt* in Kassel and Amsterdam

---

<sup>13</sup> Muller, 239, 240, 242, 243. When Rubens copied Caravaggio's *Entombment* (Vatican, copy Ottawa), for instance, he sought to correct the faults of his model, especially what was then perceived to be its excessive realism.

<sup>14</sup> Miedema, in Van Mander, *Grondt* II, 388, 389. Huygens based a short poem about Lievens's portrait *The King's Giant Porter* (Sch. 299, c. 1633, lost) closely on lines in Virgil's *Aeneid*. Huygens, in Hans Schneider, *Jan Lievens. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Mit einem Supplement von R.E.O. Ekkart.* (Amsterdam: Israels, 1973), 161.

in 2001. Nevertheless, even in this thoroughly studied area, many questions remain about the stylistic influences affecting Lievens's early style and our knowledge of his early works.

The direction Lievens took after 1632, becoming an international baroque artist and living in London, Antwerp and Berlin, is so divergent from the better-known career of Rembrandt as to elicit wonder. Little attention has been paid to the latter phase of Lievens's career, save in monographic surveys such as the 1979 exhibition in Braunschweig and the 1992 exhibition of his work on paper in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.<sup>15</sup> Jan Lievens's contemporaries viewed his later career positively. His works drew critical acclaim and he received prestigious commissions for history paintings and portraits during these years. By the nineteenth century, however, Lievens's reputation fell dramatically and he was omitted from John Smith's 1836 catalogue of Dutch and Flemish masters.<sup>16</sup> This dissertation aims to correct this historic imbalance by considering Lievens's career as a unity and examining the specific contributions of his late works.

The first chapter of this dissertation will review Lievens's early career, examining his personality, early reputation and artistic ambition, issues that Jan Jansz Orlers (1570-1646), Philips Angel (1616-1683) and Constantijn Huygens addressed in their commentaries on the artist.<sup>17</sup> What emerges from their testimony is the image of a proud

---

<sup>15</sup> *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, Rüdiger Klessmann, ed., exh. cat. (Braunschweig: Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, 1979). Peter Schatborn, *Jan Lievens 1607-1674, Prenten & Tekeningen*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksprentenkabinet, 1993).

<sup>16</sup> John A. Smith, *Catalogue Raisonné of the Works of the Most Imminent Dutch, Flemish and French Painters* (London: 1829-1842).

<sup>17</sup> Jan Jansz Orlers, student of secretary Jan Hout, was bookseller in Leiden until 1618, and alderman and burgomaster in Leiden thereafter. He published *Nassausschen laurencrans* in 1610 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1619 as

young man who worked on an ambitious, over-life-size scale and who readily sought out the patronage of kings, courtiers, the well born and well-placed. Lievens's artistic personality begins to emerge with his emphasis on originality and on assimilating the most innovative artistic trends of his day, specifically the Haarlem Genre tradition, Utrecht Caravaggism and the Flemish baroque, into his own monumental style. His friendship with Rembrandt is established, perhaps even before Rembrandt trains with Lievens's master, Pieter Lastman, and a fruitful relationship begins with Constantijn Huygens, who meets Lievens and takes an active role, through criticism and patronage, in shaping his career, perhaps even encouraging him to move to England.

The second chapter reviews the available evidence and materials relating to the period from 1632 to 1635, when Lievens was in London. Although the key works he produced there are lost, the surviving examples hint at the major transformation Lievens's style was undergoing. The available evidence will be marshaled to show Lievens's attachment to Van Dyck's studio and the court, which explains why this prodigious artist did so little independent work in London.

The third chapter covers Lievens's Antwerp period from 1635 to 1644, when he moves to the Southern Netherlands. In Antwerp Lievens initially associated with Jan Davidsz de Heem (1606-1683/4) and Adriaen Brouwer (1605/6-1638), artists who had previously lived in Holland and who had a distinct stylistic impact on his work. Van Dyck and Rubens were by 1635 largely absent from Antwerp, leaving Lievens to compete with Jordaens and a number of Rubens's students. He developed a mature and somber monumental style in Antwerp, executing large-scale religious paintings and

---

*Waerachtige beschryvinge en afbeeldinghe van alle de overwinningen*. [www.dbnl.nl](http://www.dbnl.nl) (Accessed October 4, 2005).

eventually garnering the patronage of the Jesuits for two important works by around 1638. He converted from Calvinism to Catholicism and in late 1638 married Susannah Colijns de Nole, which connected him to the Colijns de Nole family of sculptors who also worked in the Jesuit church. A trip to Leiden in 1639 and a number of commissions in Holland led to his eventual return to the Dutch Republic in 1644 where his work was already in demand.

The last chapter surveys the final nearly three-decade period of Lievens's career in Holland and Berlin. His adaptiveness and originality did not flag and this period saw the fulfillment of his ambitions as a history painter as he consistently received princely and civic commissions. At the same time he produced important portrait commissions and a considerable number of highly personal and original landscape drawings, evidence of his adaptive and acquisitive artistic personality.

In 1678, shortly after Lievens's death, Rembrandt's pupil Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627-1678) counted him among the best painters of his age. Whereas George Vertue left Lievens off the list of painters active in England, Jean-Baptiste Descamps included a laudatory entry in his *La vie des peintres* of 1754, noting that Lievens's works were placed between those of Ferdinand Bol and Govaert Flinck in Amsterdam's Town Hall and that he "sustained the comparison."<sup>18</sup>

Lievens's reputation during the nineteenth century resurged towards the mid-to-latter decades. Whereas John Smith had excluded Lievens from his publication of the mid-1840s, Charles Le Blanc included an extensive biography of Lievens in his *Histoire*

---

<sup>18</sup> Walpole's edition of Vertue represents only his selections from the notes. George Vertue, *Anecdotes of Painting in England with some account of the principal artists*, Horace Walpole, ed. (1762, London: 1828). Jean-Baptiste Descamps, *La vie des peintres Flamands, Allemand et Hollandois* (Paris: 1754), 119.

*des Peintres de toutes les écoles* of 1861.<sup>19</sup> The tercentenary of Jan Lievens's birth in 1607 was marked by two significant events in Holland. First, Ernst Wilhelm Moes published a monographic article on Lievens and secondly, from September to November of 1907, the Rijksprentenkabinett in Amsterdam presented a monographic exhibition of Lievens's prints and drawings drawn from their own rich collection.<sup>20</sup>

Cornelius Hofstede de Groot revised Smith's *Catalogue raisonné* in 1927, but excluded Lievens in the awareness that Hans Schneider of the Mauritshuis had embarked on a monographic project that, with the encouragement of the Teylers Tweede Genootschap, resulted in *Jan Lievens. Sein Leben und seine Werke* in 1932.<sup>21</sup> It contained a full catalogue of all the works known and mentioned in inventories and other documents: 356 paintings, 396 drawings and Rovinski's list of the 89 known prints (with the addition of 15 catalogued by Bartsch under Rembrandt), as well as a list of rejected attributions consisting of 89 paintings and 69 drawings.<sup>22</sup> Schneider dismissed the latter part of Lievens's career, when his works were no longer the product of some kind of

---

<sup>19</sup> Smith, *Catalogue Raisonné*. The exclusions in the materials of Vertue and Smith introduced the lacuna of awareness about Lievens to English-speaking audiences that has persisted to the present day. Charles Le Blanc, *Histoire des Peintres de toutes les écoles* (Paris, 1861).

<sup>20</sup> Moes's article was the first to make use of original sources and documents, many more of which were then published by Albert Bredius in the *Kunstler-Inventäre* of 1915. E. W. Moes, "Jan Lievens." *Leids Jaarboekje* 4 (1907): 136-164. Albert Bredius, *Kunstler-Inventäre: Urkunden zur Geschichte der holländischen Kunst des XVIen, XVIIen en XVIIIen Jahrhunderts I* (The Hague, 1915-1922), 139-142, 186-227. *Jan Lievens. Tentoonstelling in s'Rijksprentenkabinet te Amsterdam*. (Amsterdam, 1907).

<sup>21</sup> Cornelius Hofstede de Groot. *Catalogue raisonné of the Works of the Most Imminent Dutch Painters of the Seventeenth Century*. 8 vols. 1907-1927. Schneider, v-viii. My thanks to R.E.O. Ekkart for discussing Schneider's access to De Groot's notes and materials bequested to the Dutch state which formed the basis of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische en Ikonografische Documentatie in The Hague established in 1932 with Schneider as director.

<sup>22</sup> Schneider listed four drawings in the Pierpont Morgan Library and three at the Museum in Rennes, which he was not able to see to verify attributions. Schneider, 247. Adam von Bartsch, *The Illustrated Bartsch* (New York: Abaris, 1978-), Nrs. 32 (Holl.XI 1), II 25 (Holl. 28), 361 (Holl. 56), 180 (Holl. 86), 181 (Holl. 87), 308 (Holl. 88).

relationship or rivalry or friendship with Rembrandt: “the oeuvre that survives validates the rule that child prodigies, later in life, often fail to live up to the expectations placed in them.”<sup>23</sup> Schneider, however, viewed the landscapes and portraits that Lievens painted after 1644 as more successful than his late history paintings. While these works were ancillary to Lievens’s career and ambitions as a history painter, in fact they represented deeply characteristic projects of an acquisitive and restless artistic personality. From the large-scale works for the Leiden Town Hall of 1639 (Sch. 106, formerly Leiden, Fig. 106), to the prestigious 1650 Oranjezaal mural *The Five Muses* (Sum. 1206, The Hague, fig. 157) in Amalia van Solms’s palace, the Huis ten Bosch, and the 1661 *Brinio raised on a Shield* in the Town Hall of Amsterdam (Sum. 1213, fig. 168), Lievens’s career trajectory did not falter.<sup>24</sup>

In 1939, Kurt Bauch took up the problem of the relationship between Rembrandt and Lievens, branching out from his study of the early work of Rembrandt published in 1933, *Die Kunst des jungen Rembrandt*.<sup>25</sup> His thesis, that the slightly younger Lievens worked as a pupil of Rembrandt, hinged on a single painting with the inscription

---

<sup>23</sup> Schneider, 55.

<sup>24</sup> References to Schneider’s numbers (Schneider x, or Sch. x) are used for works that were omitted by Sumowski. The success of *Brinio* beckons one to re-examine the reputation of the rest of Lievens’s later oeuvre. In contrast, only a fragment remains of Rembrandt’s contribution to the Town Hall decorations project, *The Conspiracy of Claudius Civilis* (Bredius 347, 1661-2, Stockholm), after it was removed and then replaced by Govaert Flinck’s original cartoon, painted to completion by Jürriaen Ovens (1623-1678) in only four days. Lievens’s painting still occupies the adjacent lunette to this day. Schwartz, 319, 320. As Egbert Haverkamp Begemann reminded the symposium convened in Braunschweig on the occasion of the exhibition *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, far from being disastrous, the artistic level of Lievens’s work in Amsterdam in the 1650s was comparable to the late work of both Govaert Flinck (1615-1660) and Ferdinand Bol (1616-1680). Werner Sumowski, rev. *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts* (Braunschweig: Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, September 6-November 11, 1979), *Kunstchronik* 33 (1980): 9.

<sup>25</sup> Kurt Bauch, “Rembrandt und Lievens,” *Wallraff-Richartz-Jahrbuch* XI (1939), 239-268. Bauch, *Die Kunst des jungen Rembrandt*, (Heidelberg: Heidelberger Kunstgeschichtliche Abhandlungen XVI, 1933).

“Rembrandt geretuceer Liev.” This painting (Sum. 1274, c. 1628) was a *tronie* or genre head of a child like the one in Lievens’s *Gypsy Fortune-teller* of 1631 (Sum. 1187, c. 1631, Berlin, fig. 73), and also in an etching (Holl. 89).<sup>26</sup> According to Bauch the inscription meant that Rembrandt had corrected Lievens’s work the way a master would correct a pupil and it reinforced his notion of the complete primacy of Rembrandt. The inscription proved to be a later addition that was not integral to the original paint surface.<sup>27</sup>

In 1973, Schneider’s monograph was reissued with corrections and a supplement by R.E.O. Ekkart. A number of factors led to the interest in reissuing this work, among them Horst Gerson’s radically reduced revision of Bredius’s Rembrandt catalogue raisonné.<sup>28</sup> This publication was among the many events of the Rembrandt year of 1969 that stimulated interest in problems of Rembrandt attribution and the early works of Rembrandt, another of which was the establishment of the Rembrandt Research Project initially led by Joshua Bruyn. This still on-going project set out to establish a definitive Rembrandt paintings catalogue, notably with the help of technical examination. Its most significant re-attribution of a work from Rembrandt to Lievens has been a *tronie* in Windsor Castle.

Ekkart was also involved with the exhibition *Geschildert tot Leyden Anno 1626*.<sup>29</sup> Its catalog included a transcription of the 1640 inventory of the goods of Jan Jansz Orlers,

---

<sup>26</sup> Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, A 2391. F.W.H. Hollstein, *Dutch and Flemish etchings, engravings and woodcuts c. 1450-1700*, XI (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1955). All references to Lievens’s prints will use the numbers assigned by Hollstein, if included.

<sup>27</sup> Sumowski, *Gemälde* III, 1804.

<sup>28</sup> Gerson, *Rembrandt*.

<sup>29</sup> *Geschildert tot Leyden Anno 1626*, Marten Wurfbain, ed., exh. cat. (Leiden: Stedelijk Museum De

Lievens's first biographer, which deepened the understanding of his role in Lievens's early career. Ernst van de Wetering of the Rembrandt Research Project discussed the studio practices of Rembrandt, Lievens and others using evidence drawn from these documents and artworks.<sup>30</sup> He marshaled technical evidence to support the notion that the two artists shared a studio for practical and economic reasons and explored their artistic interchange in works in which they use each other as models.

The most significant exhibition of Lievens's works was the 1979 monographic exhibition *Jan Lievens: ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandt* organized by Rüdiger Klessmann and presented at the Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum in Braunschweig.<sup>31</sup> Of the 48 paintings exhibited, only 16 represented the last 42 years of his life versus 32 that were done in his first roughly nine years in Leiden. Many of Lievens's key history paintings are integrated into walls and could not travel, thus his later career was represented primarily by landscape drawings, a testimony to Lievens's dedication to that genre, and a significant proportion of his output in Antwerp and Amsterdam. Lievens's woodcut prints, mostly done in Antwerp, were a revelation whose genesis still defies adequate explanation. While this exhibition showed that Lievens's output was consistently high in quality, it did not directly address the issue of his ambition and reputation later in his career.

In 1983 Werner Sumowski, who had authored an article on some of Lievens's landscape drawings in 1979, published the first volume of his *Gemälde der Rembrandt-*

---

Lakenhal, 1977).

<sup>30</sup> Ernst van de Wetering, "Leidse Schilders achter de ezels," *Geschildert tot Leyden*, 21- 31.

<sup>31</sup> *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*.



*Schuler*, eventually completed by an additional five volumes.<sup>32</sup> The third volume contained a catalogue of Jan Lievens's paintings and a short monographic essay. The inclusion of Lievens in the "School" of Rembrandt is misleading and problematic but rises from the function of the series as a tool in Rembrandt and Rembrandt-school connoisseurship, a kind of corollary to the Rembrandt Research Project and related efforts. Most notable for providing a complete set of full-page illustrations, Sumowski's work is an aid to connoisseurship that provides only a minimal apparatus of a catalogue raisonné, with little emphasis on biography, context or narrative. While Schneider and Ekkart list de-attributions and lost or untraceable works, Sumowski scatters these in other sections often without supplying rationale or comment.<sup>33</sup> Sumowski dismissed Lievens's later work, declaring: "The time of productive and consistently fastidious quality had passed."<sup>34</sup>

The following decade saw the publication of two studies on the relationship between Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden; first the 1992 exhibition *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden* at the Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal in Leiden, followed by Helga Gutbrod's 1996 dissertation *Lievens und Rembrandt, Studien zum Verhältnis ihrer Kunst*.<sup>35</sup> The latter study was a discussion of all the known works by both artists before

---

<sup>32</sup> Werner Sumowski, "Observations on Jan Lievens's Landscape Drawings," *Master Drawings* 18 (1980): 370-372. Werner Sumowski, *Gemälde der Rembrandt Schüler III* (Landau/Pfalz: Pfälzische Verlagsanstalt, 1983).

<sup>33</sup> Sumowski's facing-page illustrations can be misleading as in the example of *Jacob and Joseph's Bloody Coat* (Sum. 1203, c. 1635-1641, Aix-en-Provence, fig. 111), which faces the similar *Holy Family* (Sum. 1203, Wilmers A27, c. 1635-1640, Antwerp), a work not by Lievens but Cornelis Schut. Gertrude Wilmers, *Cornelis Schut (1597-1655). A Flemish Painter of the High Baroque*, (Brussels: Brepols, 1996), 91-92.

<sup>34</sup> Sumowski, *Gemälde III*, 1767.

<sup>35</sup> *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, Christiaan Vogelaar, ed., exh. cat. (Leiden: Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal: 1991). Helga Gutbrod, *Lievens und Rembrandt, Studien zum Verhältnis ihrer Kunst*, diss. U.

they each departed Leiden by 1632. It began with an appeal for rehabilitating the reputation of Lievens, but the subsequent attempts to settle a number of attribution problems did not always sustain this objective.

The 1992 Leiden exhibition *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, while closely related to the 1976 Leiden exhibition *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1626*, was in fact a focused and direct presentation of the working relationship between the two artists and rivals, bringing together their respective versions of *Samson and Delilah*, *Christ on the Cross*, *The Raising of Lazarus* and works for the Stadhouder's court. The interest in this fertile subject has grown and another exhibition of 2001 covered the same territory on an expanded scale. *The Mystery of the Young Rembrandt* was organized by Bernard Schnackenburg in Amsterdam and Kassel, whose museum had recently acquired the early Lievens series *The Four Elements* (Sum.1216, 1217, 1218 and 1219, c. 1625, figs. 42, 43).<sup>36</sup> Schnackenburg elaborated on his notions about the sharing of a plaster model between Rembrandt and Lievens in a subsequent article in *Oud Holland*.<sup>37</sup>

The high level of interest in Lievens's relationship with Rembrandt has done little to elucidate the qualities of Lievens's work that specifically appealed to the critics, collectors, courts and clients who esteemed his work in his own day. Why did Huygens so value Lievens's very sober portrait of him (Sum. 1286, 1628-29, on loan to Amsterdam, fig. 20)? Was the only thing that set Lievens's *Raising of Lazarus* (Sum.

---

Wurzburg. (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1996).

<sup>36</sup> *The Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*. ed. Bernard Schnackenburg, exh. cat. (Kassel: Schloss Wilhelmshohe, 2001).

<sup>37</sup> Bernard Schnackenburg, "Knabe im Atelier und Bucherstilleben, zwei fruhe Gemälde von Jan Lievens und ihr Leidener Kontext: Rembrandt, Jan Davidz de Heem, Pieter Codde," *Oud Holland* 117 (2004): 33 - 47.

1193, 1631, Brighton, fig. 66) apart its baroque and artificial theatricality, as Herwig Guratzsch has suggested in his survey of the Northern tradition of Lazarus iconography?<sup>38</sup> Was Lievens's 1661 *Brinio raised on a Shield* (Sum. 1213, Amsterdam, fig. 168) no more sophisticated than any generic "triumph of Louis XIV", as Hans Schneider wrote in his monograph?<sup>39</sup> The present study aims to discuss Lievens's ambitions and success in the light of the critical judgment of his own day. Lievens's mature work is united by a somber monumentality that permeates even his portraits and genre painting, and reflects the noble and ambitious character of his lifelong artistic project. The value of the iconographic and stylistic sources and influences Lievens so skillfully assimilated and adapted, as well as his iconographic innovations, are at times lost on viewers today. The history paintings of his later career that can seem awkward and overbearing to the modern eye were in fact were the products of the same ambitious personality who constantly set himself in artistic dialogue with other artists and deliberately adapted himself to changing tastes and the specific contexts of commissioned works and the different artistic centers between which he moved. It is only by examining his goals in each of his late projects, from the *Five Muses* to *Mars*, that we can gain greater sympathy for his achievement and understand the esteem in which he was held by his peers.

---

<sup>38</sup> Herwig Guratzsch, *Die Auferweckung des Lazarus in der niederländischen Kunst von 1400 bis 1700. Ikonographie und Ikonologie I* (Kortrijk: Van Ghemert, 1980), 146 ff.

<sup>39</sup> Schneider, 65. Schneider owned the sketch for this painting (Sum. 1212, c. 1660, Amsterdam) at the time he was writing his monograph.

## Chapter 1: Jan Lievens in Leiden, 1607-1632

### Lievens's parents in Leiden

Jan Lievens was born on October 24, 1607 in Leiden, the second son of Lieven Hendriksz and Machtelt *van Noortsant*.<sup>40</sup> Jan Janz Orlers recorded the date in his 1641 edition of the *Beschrijvinge der Stadt Leiden* (“Description of the City of Leiden”), one of the many town histories that was produced in seventeenth-century Holland, and a work similar to Samuel Ampzing’s 1628 volume on Haarlem.<sup>41</sup> Orlers was an especially close witness to Lievens’s life as he lived across the street from the Lievens family and was an early collector of Jan’s paintings.

Lieven Hendricksz was an embroiderer and hat-maker who had come to Leiden from Ghent in the wave of Protestant refugees that moved northward to Holland. He presumably left Ghent around 1584, as the Duke of Parma expelled the Protestants from the city after it surrendered. He arrived in a city that would nearly quadruple its population by immigration, mainly due to religious refugees from Flanders (from about 12,000 in 1581 to 44,745 in 1622). Many of those refugees were skilled textile workers

---

<sup>40</sup> Guardians were appointed for Jan Lievens in January of 1623 as a result of the death of his mother Machtelt Jansdr van Noortsant on July 1, 1622. His age at that time was recorded as 14, which accords with Orlers’s information about his date of birth. P. J. M De Baar and Ingrid W. L. Moerman, “Rembrandt van Rijn en Jan Lievens, inwoners van Leiden,” *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 26, 27.

<sup>41</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 135.

like Lievens Hendricksz.<sup>42</sup> They transformed Leiden's textile industry, which had previously focused on rough woolen cloth and blankets, into a producer of fine goods.

Leiden had itself endured the Spanish onslaught in the form of the 1574 siege, which had shaped its character as a bastion of resistance to religious persecution of the type that had affected Lievens's father and may have attracted the family to Leiden in particular. Jan Lievens's grandparents, Joos Hendricks and Margaretha Smunx, also seem to have moved to Leiden since Smunx was buried in the Hooglandse Kerk in 1639.<sup>43</sup>

### **The life of Jan Lievens**

Jan Jansz Orlers, councilor and later burgomaster in Leiden, was an early collector of Lievens's works.<sup>44</sup> He praised Lievens in the 1641 and possibly arranged for Lievens's introduction to Constantijn Huygens in 1628, the meeting that led to a portrait.<sup>45</sup> Living across the street from Lievens on the narrow Pieterskerkchoorsteeg (or Choorsteeg) in Leiden, Orlers had a close view of the painter's artistic development and success in the city from the time of Lievens's return after training with Lastman in

---

<sup>42</sup> P. J. M. De Baar and Ingrid Moerman, "Rembrandt and Jan Lievens, inwoner van Leiden," *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, Christiaan Vogelaar, ed., exh. cat. (Leiden: Stedelijk Museum het Lakenhal: 1991): 24.

<sup>43</sup> Joos Hendricks may have died in Ghent. Margaretha Smunx remarried in 1626 to Andries Appelman, born in Brussels. They had one child, Isaak, from this marriage. On her death she was living on the "Koorsteeg". P. J. M. De Baar, *De Leidse Verwanten van Rembrandt van Rijn en hun Leidse Aftstammelingen tot heden*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. rev. (Leiden: Gemeentearchief, 1992), 16.

<sup>44</sup> Significantly no works by Rembrandt are listed in Orlers's 1640 inventory. *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1626*, 17–18.

<sup>45</sup> Schwartz, 81.

Amsterdam, around 1619, until the Lievens family moved to the larger house in the nearby Breestraat in 1628.<sup>46</sup>

Jan Lievens's parents, Lieven Hendricksz and Machtelt van Noortsant, married in 1605. Their birth dates are not known. She was the daughter of Jan Dircksz van Noortsant and Grietgen Aernstsd'r Noortsant of Leiden. Their first son, Joost, was likely born in 1606 since Jan Lievens was born on October 24, 1607.<sup>47</sup> Joost would register at the Latin Academy in 1622, but already in 1615 Jan Lievens, an eight-year old, had begun training as a painter with Joris van Schooten, Leiden's most prominent portraitist. Lievens continued as a student of Van Schooten's until he was ten years old (1617/18). In October 1618 he was at home in Leiden during the armed strife between the Remonstrants and the Calvinist Counter-Remonstrants.<sup>48</sup> After October 1618 Lievens began a two-year apprenticeship with the Catholic Pieter Lastman, the preeminent history painter in Amsterdam, from late 1618 until around 1620/21.

Orlens wrote that Lievens was fourteen years old in 1621 when he painted a portrait of his mother Machtelt van Noortsant, who passed away the following year.<sup>49</sup> In 1622 Lieven Hendricksz became a tax collector in Leiden like his half-brother Isaack

---

<sup>46</sup> De Baar and Moerman, 25, 28.

<sup>47</sup> Joost Lievens matriculated at the University in 1622. He took on the last name of De Rechte, as did his father at times. De Baar, 16-17.

<sup>48</sup> This inter-Protestant conflict pitted the Calvinist Gomarists, or followers of the Leiden theologian Gomarus, against the Arminians, or followers of the theologian Arminius who rejected John Calvin's doctrine of predestination. Flemish refugee families like Lievens's were typically Calvinist, since Calvinism had dominated Flanders and Antwerp before they left. De Baar and Moerman, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 32-33.

<sup>49</sup> Orlens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139. The information cannot be corroborated by guild records since Leiden had no separate painter's guild in 1615, to regulate the trade or by which to trace the education of apprentices like Lievens, or the professional activity of artists like Orlens. Hessel Miedema, "Philips Angels *Lof der Schilder-konst*" *Oud Holland* 103 (1989): 189-190. Only in 1625 did the loosely organized painters' association begin keeping records of apprentices.

Appelman, and by 1628 had become wealthy enough to move from the Pieterskerkchoorsteeg to a larger house on the nearby Breestraat.<sup>50</sup>

Lievens was an independent master from about 1621 on, and seems to have stayed in Leiden until 1632. Rembrandt van Rijn's first works of c. 1623/4, such as *The Three Singers* (Bredius 421, W. Baron van Dedem Collection, fig. 12), show the influence of Lievens's early genre paintings such as *Five Senses* (Sum. 1179, c. 1623, formerly Chicago, fig. 9). The friendship and close artistic relationship between the two men resumed after Rembrandt's return from a short six-month period of study with Lievens's master Lastman in 1624 or 1625.<sup>51</sup> This relationship would intensify until both artists left Leiden by 1632. In 1626, when Lievens registered with the civic guard, his father declared that Lievens taught at the academy ("mitsdien as membrum academiae synde").<sup>52</sup> Around 1628 Lievens met Constantijn Huygens in Leiden and began painting his portrait. Huygens introduced Lievens to the Flemish painter Anthony van Dyck in The Hague during the winter of 1631/32 and Van Dyck painted a portrait of Lievens to be engraved for his series of prints later known as the *Iconographia*. Huygens would promote Lievens for much of the rest of his career. Lievens had been planning to go to England for some years before he finally embarked in 1632, thus around the same time as

---

<sup>50</sup> De Baar, 16.

<sup>51</sup> De Baar and Moerman propose that Rembrandt studied with Lastman from November 1623 until May, 1624 at the earliest. De Baar and Moerman, 34. See also Ernst van de Wetering, "Rembrandt's beginnings – an Essay," *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, Bernhard Schnackenburg, ed., exh. cat. (Kassel: Staatliche Museen Kassel, 2001), 43-49.

<sup>52</sup> "Lieven Hendrics met sijn soon ter vergaderinge verschenen zynde en den hoofdmans aengeseyt hebbende dat sijn soon noch geen twintich jaeren out en was, en dat hij mitsdien als membrum academiae synde, voor als noch van de nachtwachte als schutter behoorde geëxcusseert te sijn, hebben deecken en hoofdmans op de voorss. verclaringe syn soon voor als noch daarvan gexcusseert." *Journal der Leidsche Schutterij*, 8 Mei 1626, in Moes, 141.

Van Dyck. In England Lievens emulated the practice of Van Dyck, producing portraits of Charles I, his family members and various courtiers, as well as his first landscape drawings.

Lievens left London for Antwerp around 1635 and stayed until early 1644 with a brief stay in Leiden in 1639. During that time, in 1636, Jan Lievens took on his first pupil, Hans van den Wijngaerde. Lievens had converted to Catholicism by 1638 when he married Susannah Colijns de Nole. He painted two large works for the Jesuits around 1638, his only major commissions in Antwerp, and the following year he traveled to Leiden on the occasion of a civic commission for the Town Hall. Jan Lievens and Susannah's only surviving child, Jan Andrea, was born in January 1644, but by March 1 the family had left Antwerp and settled in Amsterdam, although sadly Susannah died the following year.<sup>53</sup>

Almost immediately upon arriving in Amsterdam, Lievens painted for the Stadhouder and Amsterdam patricians. In August 1648, he married Cornelia de Bray, daughter of an Amsterdam notary. The couple would have five surviving children and the family seems to have remained Catholic. In 1650 Lievens produced a major commissioned work for Amalia van Solms's Huis ten Bosch in The Hague and from 1653-1654 he worked in Berlin for Van Solms's eldest daughter, married to the Elector of Brandenburg. Lievens resumed contact with Rembrandt between 1644 and 1657, selling him several of his Antwerp-period landscapes. He also produced a portrait drawing of him around 1661 (Sum. D 1756xx, Leiden, fig. 171).

Upon Lievens's return from Berlin he moved to The Hague, where he was a founding member of the painter's confraternity *Pictura* in 1656. In that same year, and

---

<sup>53</sup> F. J. van den Branden, "Jan Lievens," *Notas*. Antwerpse Stadsarchief PK 3577.



again in 1661, Lievens produced two major works for the new Town Hall of Amsterdam. He moved back to Amsterdam in 1658 and took on a certain Erick de Weerelt as student in 1662. In 1663 he received a major civic commission in The Hague and subsequently was in Leiden in 1666 and 1669, under the patronage of Amelis van Bouchorst, chairman of the powerful Gecomitteerde Raden of the States of Holland and Dike-reeve of the Hoogheemraadschap Rijnland in Leiden. Lievens traveled to Cleves with other Amsterdam artists in 1663, producing drawings of the landscape along the way (Sch. Z 194). Two years later his son Jan Andrea began working as an artist, but he also dramatically and violently rebelled against his father, who finally petitioned to have him arrested. By 1668 Jan Andrea had married and established himself as an independent master.<sup>54</sup> From 1667-1668 Lievens instructed a number of amateurs including Jonas Witsen, Aron Chavez and Jacob Cardoso Ribera.<sup>55</sup>

Cornelia de Bray passed away in 1668, leaving Jan Lievens with five children, three of them dependants.<sup>56</sup> Jan Lievens's last major civic commission came in 1669, his last portrait commission in 1671, and he took on his last pupil, Denys Godijn of The Hague, in 1670.<sup>57</sup> After 1669 he moved every few months, living alternately in The Hague, Leiden and Amsterdam, where he passed away on July 3, 1674. He had consulted a physician in Dordrecht in 1669 and spent a considerable sum on medicines

---

<sup>54</sup> Schneider, 279.

<sup>55</sup> Schneider, 278.

<sup>56</sup> De Baar, 17. Lievens's client Daniel du Bordieu demanded payment for the costs of maintaining three of Lievens's children under his roof for a period during 1671. Bredius I, 211.

<sup>57</sup> Schneider, 278.

shortly before his death in 1674.<sup>58</sup> His son Jan Andrea took responsibility for arranging the burial in the Nieuwe Kerk four days after his death, out of a sense of “filial duty.”<sup>59</sup> Jan Lievens’s children declined the estate, correctly fearing that it was heavily in debt.<sup>60</sup> His indebtedness is evident in the estate inventory taken on August 16 and 21, 1674.<sup>61</sup>

### **Lievens’s siblings**

Lievens’s older brother Joost registered at the University in 1622 and ten years later married Maria Steen, niece to the painter Jan Steen. The bookshop and press he owned were located on the prestigious Rapenburg. Jan Lievens’s younger brother Dirk was born c. 1612 and registered at Leiden University in 1635, probably after training as an artist with Jan Lievens.<sup>62</sup> In 1639 Dirk made a portrait of Caspar van Baerle and was planning a series of etched portraits of all the professors at Leiden, although he produced only one, of Cornelis van Haesdonck.<sup>63</sup> He lived in Amsterdam when Jan moved to that city from Antwerp in 1644.<sup>64</sup> In 1648 Dirk departed for the East Indies, where he died in 1650. A sister, Grietge, was born around 1614 and would marry the surgeon Lieven

---

<sup>58</sup> Bredius I, 189, 207.

<sup>59</sup> Bredius I, 213.

<sup>60</sup> Bredius I, 213.

<sup>61</sup> Bredius I, 198.

<sup>62</sup> De Baar, 16.

<sup>63</sup> Schneider, 278-279.

<sup>64</sup> In 1640 Dirk claimed his mother’s inheritance in Leiden’s Orphan’s Chamber, declaring that he was a painter living in Amsterdam. De Baar, 16

Corsz van Hasevelt of Leiden.<sup>65</sup> Titus, the family's second prodigy, was born around 1616, and registered at the University at the age of 10. Titus, like Jan, was probably living at the family home in the late 1620s. He later went on to teach at the Latin School in The Hague. Titus claimed his mother's inheritance in 1641, and died in The Hague some time after 1663.<sup>66</sup> He was living in The Hague at the time Jan worked on the decorations of Amalia van Solms's Huis ten Bosch in 1650, and when Jan Lievens lived in The Hague from 1654-1658. Titus and Joost both latinized their names to Justus Livius and Titus Livius respectively.

In 1618, Jan Lievens's twin sisters Rachel and Leah were born. While Leah would remain in Leiden her whole life, Rachel married the Amsterdam notary Johannes van der Hoeven in 1640 and thus lived in Amsterdam at the same time as both Dirk and Jan, who moved there in 1644.<sup>67</sup> During his later peregrinations, therefore, Lievens had siblings in nearly every city in Holland in which he lived. Another sister, Jannetgen, was baptized 1622 on March 2, four days before their mother Machtelt van Noortsandt was buried in the Hooglandse Kerk on March 6. Jan Lievens painting of his mother that he executed when he was 14 (after October, 1621) years old showed her well into that last pregnancy, and very close to her tragically premature death.<sup>68</sup> Six years later Jan Lievens's father Lieven Hendricksz remarried. Annetgen Commersdr van der Marck was from Delft and bore one child that survived to adulthood, Vroon, who lived in Leiden and

---

<sup>65</sup> Lieven Corsz van Hasevelt was the son of Cors Cornelisz van Hasevelt. De Baar, 17.

<sup>66</sup> De Baar, 16.

<sup>67</sup> Susannah de Bray, who Jan Lievens married in 1648, was the daughter of an Amsterdam notary. De Baar, 16.

<sup>68</sup> Orlers, 375.

owned the c. 1639 portrait painted by Jan of their father Lieven Hendricksz.<sup>69</sup>

Jan Lievens was the only boy in his family who did not study at the Latin academy, although he seems to have had some connection to it. At times, Lievens seems to have exploited the expertise of his educated brothers living under the same roof, and imitated them in latinizing his name. In arguing for a militia exemption for his son in 1626, Lieven Hendricksz testified that Jan Lievens was a “member” of the Academy, that is, that he taught there, presumably offering instruction in drawing.<sup>70</sup> While some have speculated that Lievens’s friend Rembrandt assisted Lievens by adding Greek or Latin inscriptions to some of his paintings, such as *St. Paul writing to the Thessalonians* (Sum. 1640, c. 1639, Bremen, Fig. 21) and inspired him to latinize his name, that influence likely came from Lievens’s own siblings who were equally, if not more well educated than Rembrandt.<sup>71</sup>

### Lievens’s training

#### Joris van Schooten

According to Orlers, Jan Lievens began his artistic training at a very young age; “...and considering the great inclination and passion that his son had towards the art of painting, [his father] placed him, only eight years old, to establish in him the

---

<sup>69</sup> De Baar, 17.

<sup>70</sup> *Journal der Leidsche Schutterij*, May 8, 1626, in Moes, 141.

<sup>71</sup> Kurt Bauch, *Rembrandt. Gemälde* (Berlin: 1966), 29. Jan Białostocki, “Lievens und Rembrandt,” *Jan Lievens, ein maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 15.

fundamentals and rudiments of this art, with one Joris Verschoten” until the age of ten, thus until 1617/18.<sup>72</sup> Joris van Schooten was a sensitive and accomplished portraitist and history painter who had himself had trained in The Hague from c. 1604 to c. 1610 with Everard Crynsz van der Maes (1577-1646/7).<sup>73</sup> As Maarten Wurfbaun noted, Van Schooten brought to Leiden the fashionable courtly trends manifest in the work of Jan Anthonisz van Ravesteyn and Michiel van Mierevelt.<sup>74</sup>

### **Pieter Lastman**

Orlens continues in his text on Lievens: “When he was around ten years old, his father, seeing the excessive desire he had to learn and progress, thought it good to bring him to the celebrated painter Pieter Lastman in Amsterdam, where he stayed around two years, making great advances in art.”<sup>75</sup> By this account, therefore, Lievens would have been in Amsterdam for two years from 1617 or 1618 until 1619 or 1620.<sup>76</sup> Later in his text, however, as Gutbrod has noted, Orlens mentions that Lievens was in his father’s

---

<sup>72</sup> Orlens, 375.

<sup>73</sup> Van Schooten’s masterpiece is the *Civic Guard Company of Captain Harman van Brosterhuysen* of 1626 (Lakenhal, Leiden). *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1627*, 36-37. Van Schooten was, like Jan Lievens, the son of Flemish immigrants. He later also taught the portraitist and history painter Abraham van den Tempel.

<sup>74</sup> Edwin Buijsen, *Haagse Schilders in de Gouden Eeuw* (The Hague: Hoogsteder and Hoogsteder, 1998), 200-205. Van Schooten also produced history paintings such as the elaborate and learned *Tabula Cebetis* of 1624 (Leiden), commissioned by the Latin School in Leiden. Although done well after Lievens finished his training with Van Schooten, it suggests a strong affinity with the work of Lastman of Amsterdam. *Geschildert tot Leiden anno 1626*, 37, 50-51.

<sup>75</sup> Orlens, 136, translation mine. Houbraken I, 296.

<sup>76</sup> *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 13, 82.

house in Leiden on October 4, 1618, busily copying prints by the Haarlem artist Willem Buytewech (1591-1624) while the armed conflict between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants raged outside, "...de liefde totte Konst meer achtende als alltgewoel van de werelt" ("...love of art was more important than all the unrest in the world").<sup>77</sup> While it is possible that Orlers used rhetorical exaggeration to indicate that even riots could not break Lievens's concentration, it seems probable, as Gutbrod has already concluded, that Lievens's training in Amsterdam therefore began sometime after October 4, 1618. Somewhat later Orlers allows that Lievens may have returned to Leiden in 1620 or 1621 since on his return he was "...twaelf of weynich meer Jaren oudt sijnde.." ("...being twelve, or a few more years old...").<sup>78</sup> In any event, by 1621 Lievens was once again in Leiden, where he painted the portrait of his mother.<sup>79</sup>

Pieter Lastman was Amsterdam's most prominent history painter of the second and third decades of the seventeenth century. Together with Jan Pynas (1581/2-1631), Pynas's brother Jacob (1592/3-after 1650), and their brother-in-law Jan Tegnagel (1584-1635), as well as Claes Moeyaert (1591-1655), Lastman belonged to a circle of Amsterdam artists who had been to Rome.<sup>80</sup> They practiced a kind of classicist style heavily influenced by Adam Elsheimer (1578-1610), a northern painter living in Rome whose oeuvre was small but whose anti-mannerist style, related to that of the Carracci

---

<sup>77</sup> Lievens was barely eleven, in all likelihood still too young to interest himself in religious conflicts. Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139. Lievens's interest in Buytewech likely came through Lastman, whose Italian types are very close to Buytewech's figures of noblemen. Gutbrod, 46-48. For a detailed discussion of the Arminian-Gomarist conflict, see Arie Theo van Deursen, *Bavianen en Slijkgeuzen*, (1974, Franeker: Van Wijnen, 1991).

<sup>78</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 138.

<sup>79</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

<sup>80</sup> Astrid Tümpel, *The Pre-rembrandtists*, exh. cat. (Sacramento: Crocker Art Gallery, 1974), 63

and the Bolognese school, had a widespread impact on Dutch expatriate artists living in Rome. Lastman himself was in Rome and Venice from 1602 to 1607.<sup>81</sup>

Lastman's subjects ranged from popular themes such as the *Raising of Lazarus* to more obscure ones such as *Paul and Barnabas at Lystra* (1615, Warsaw) and *David and Uriah* (1619, Groningen).<sup>82</sup> He depicted many narratives never before treated by Dutch painters, and inspired Lievens through the ambitious range and complexity of his subject matter.<sup>83</sup> Lievens admired Lastman's narrative clarity and dramatic intensity, as is evident in the contained and clear gestures of his figures. Lievens was also influenced by Lastman's rich still life and landscape detail and his bold use of strong colors in large areas as seen in *Old Woman reading* (Sum. 1214, c. 1621-23, Philadelphia, fig. 6) and *Feast of Esther* (Sum. 1181, c. 1625, Raleigh, fig. 14).<sup>84</sup>

Lievens's interest in Lastman's compositional manner is evident in many of his drawings of the mid-1620s such as *Mucius Scaevola* (Sum. D 1623x, c. 1625, Leiden, fig. 22) and *The Stoning of St. Paul in Lystra* (Sum. D 1622x, c. 1625, London, fig. 23).<sup>85</sup> Lievens also produced a tremendous range of biblical narratives throughout his career and, like Lastman, depicted obscure and sometimes unprecedented subjects, such as *Moses trampling the Crown of Pharaoh* (Sum. 1201, c. 1639, Lille, fig. 110) and *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* (Sum. 1199, c. 1636, Braunschweig, fig. 99). A

---

<sup>81</sup> Tümpel, 47.

<sup>82</sup> Broos, "Rembrandt van Rijn," 193. Lastman borrowed the figures of Paul and Barnabas in *Paul and Barnabas at Lystra* from Raphael's Sistine Chapel tapestry of Peter and Paul healing the lame man, a kind of emulation that inspired Lievens in his woodcut print *Cain killing Abel* (Holl. 99, c. 1639).

<sup>83</sup> Broos, "Rembrandt van Rijn," 193.

<sup>84</sup> Joshua Bruyn et al., *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings I* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982), 454.

<sup>85</sup> Sumowski, *Drawings of the Rembrandt School VII*, Walter L. Strauss, trans., ed., (New York: Abaris Books, 1983). All Lievens's drawings are identified by Sumowski's drawings catalogue number (Sum. D).

number of the subjects of Lievens's major early history paintings depict subjects found within Lastman's oeuvre, such as *The Raising of Lazarus* (Sum. 1193, 1631, Brighton, fig. 66), *The Toilet of Bathsheba* (Sum. 1188, c. 1631, formerly Berlin), and *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (Sum. 1195, c. 1635, Rome, fig. 97).<sup>86</sup> Lastman's most lasting impact on Lievens was in the shaping of Lievens's ambition and artistic identity as a history painter.

Nevertheless, although Lievens retained a commitment to history painting, he deviated from Lastman's style of small-scale full-length figures by favoring large-scale, half-length figures that recall the genre compositions of Gerrit van Honthorst, Hendrick ter Brugghen (1588-1629) and Peter Paul Rubens.<sup>87</sup> Lievens's large-scale painting of *The Feast of Esther* (Sum. 1181, c. 1625, Raleigh, fig. 14), with its boldly lit half-length figures, shows the influence of the Utrecht Caravaggisti eclipsing that of Lastman by the early 1620s. Lievens also adopted their genre subject matter, from tavern and low-life scenes to allegories.<sup>88</sup>

Lievens's interest in the art of Caravaggio's northern followers is manifest most clearly in works such as the *Old Woman reading* (Sum. 1214, c. 1621-3, Philadelphia, fig. 6), the c. 1625 *Pilate washing his Hands* (Sum. 1180, Leiden, fig. 13), the c. 1625 *Feast of Esther* and the dramatically lit self-portrait of c. 1631 (Sum. 1264, c. 1631,

---

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Pieter Lastman, *Sacrifice of Isaac* (1612, The Hague). A key example among Lastman's many versions of the *Raising of Lazarus* is the 1622 panel (Leiden). Other compositions which influenced Lievens were *The Toilet of Bathsheba* (1619, St. Petersburg), *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (1612, The Hague).

<sup>87</sup> The use of shaded respossoir figures like Haman in *Esther and Ahashuerus*, cast in darkness with their backs to the viewer and cutting a diagonal line across the foreground, is due more to the influence of Honthorst than Lastman, cf. *Musical Group by Candlelight* (1623, Copenhagen), and also evident in Rembrandt's 1625 *Stoning of Stephen* (Bredius 531, Lyon). An incorrect attribution of the *Feast of Esther* to Rembrandt that endured until the 1960s attests to the Lastmanesque quality of the Raleigh painting. Sumowski, *Gemälde III*, 1776.

<sup>88</sup> Examples include the *Backgammon Players* (Sum 1178, c. 1623, Cape Town) and *Five Senses* (Sum. 1179, c. 1623, formerly Chicago).



Edinburgh, fig. 33). It is not clear where he would have seen specific works of Ter Brugghen and Honthorst, but since their influence is apparent from the beginning, he likely knew their work from Amsterdam collections during his apprenticeship with Lastman. In his c. 1625 *Pilate washing his Hands* (fig. 13), for example, Lievens loosely followed Hendrick Ter Brugghen's c. 1621 painting of the same subject.<sup>89</sup> The dominant influence of the Utrecht Caravaggisti on Lievens has always been correctly assessed, but the possible impact of works by or after Caravaggio himself in Amsterdam collections cannot be overlooked. In 1619 Lastman appraised a painting by Caravaggio in an Amsterdam collection while Lievens was his pupil.<sup>90</sup> Only three years earlier, in 1616, Caravaggio's *Madonna of the Rosary* (c. 1606-7, Vienna) had been listed in the inventory of the Amsterdam art dealer Abraham Vinck along with a lost Caravaggio *Judith and Holofernes*, paintings he owned jointly with Louis Finson (1580-1617). Finson himself owned a third painting by Caravaggio and produced copies after Caravaggio as well as works in his style.<sup>91</sup>

Lievens could have witnessed the powerful impact of Caravaggio on Rubens in a painting that was surprisingly close at hand. One of Rubens's versions of *Judith and Holofernes*, with large-scale half-length figures dramatically lit from the candle in the painting (likely the c. 1617 version now in Braunschweig), was in a Leiden Collection in

---

<sup>89</sup> *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 192-195.

<sup>90</sup> Ben Broos, "Pieter Lastman," *Grove Dictionary of Art*, 193-194.

<sup>91</sup> Finson was an Antwerp Caravaggist painter who lived in Amsterdam from 1616 until his death the next year. Elements of Finson's copy of Caravaggio's *Penitent Magdalene*, such as the folded hands tilted towards the viewer, can perhaps be detected in one of Lievens's versions of the subject (Sum. 1237, c. 1630, Kingston), but the added vanitas element of the skull reflects Lievens's roots in Leiden and his own works with vanitas imagery (cf. *Boy blowing Bubbles*, Sum.1227, c. 1628, Besançon, fig. 48). Bert W. Meijer, "Italian Paintings in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Holland," *L'Europa e l'arte italiana*, Max Seidel, ed. (Venice: Marsilio, 2000), 333.

1621.<sup>92</sup> In works like *Pilate* and *Feast of Esther*, Lievens shows a high level of interest in the psychological intensity of the Caravaggesque movement but retains a distinctly still and dignified tone and Lastmanesque color.

At least four years passed between when Lievens's returned to Leiden in 1620-21, and Rembrandt's six months of training with Lastman from 1624 to 1625. Despite the brevity of his stay there, Rembrandt retained Lastman's style in paintings dated to 1626, directly emulating his master's compositions in *Baptism of the Eunuch* (Utrecht) and *Balaam and the Ass* (Bredius 487, Paris) and his manner in *History Painting* (Bredius 460, Leiden). Despite Lievens's much longer tenure with Lastman, he developed an independent stylistic path immediately after leaving the workshop.<sup>93</sup>

### **The question of training in Antwerp c. 1620**

To help explain certain features of Lievens's early work that reflect the influence of Peter Paul Rubens, J. Douglas Stewart proposed that Lievens went to Antwerp around 1620-21 (just before the expiration of the twelve-year truce between the Northern Netherlands and Spain) and that he visited Rubens's workshop to continue his education.<sup>94</sup> Stewart proposed that Lievens had his portrait painted ("pinxit") by Van

---

<sup>92</sup> *Barocke Leidenschaften*, Nils Büttner and Ulrich Heinen, eds., exh. cat. (Braunschweig: Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, 2004), 121. Arnoldus Buchelius, "*Res Pictoriae*" *Aantekeningen over Kuntenaers en Kunstwerken (1583-1639)*, G.J. Hogewerff and J.Q. van Regteren Altena, eds. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1928), 49.

<sup>93</sup> Broos, "Rembrandt," 195.

<sup>94</sup> J. Douglas Stewart, "Before Rembrandt's 'Shadow' Fell: Lievens, Van Dyck and Rubens: Some Reconsiderations," *Hofstede Mercury* 11, (1990): 42-47.

Dyck on this trip rather than some time after 1630. This portrait was published by Lucas Vorsterman (1595-1675) (Holl. XLIII 174/ii, fig. 1) and included in Van Dyck's series later known as the *Iconographia*. Van Dyck's portrait, generally dated 1631/2 rather than c. 1621, is the only securely identified portrait of Lievens by another artist, and was traditionally thought to show Lievens when he was nearly twenty-four. Stewart expanded on his thesis in a subsequent publication of 2005, suggesting that while Lievens was in Antwerp, he served Rubens as a model for one of the figures in the master's Caravaggist painting *Old Woman with Two Boys and a Coal Pot* of c. 1618-1620 (Dresden).<sup>95</sup> Stewart also refers to Lievens's copy (Sum. D 1638, c. 1627/8, location unknown, fig. 4) after a Rubens *tronie* (c. 1618, Vienna, fig. 3), and suggests it was drawn while Lievens was in Rubens's workshop although the style of this work and that of the print that Lievens published after it (Holl. 74, c. 1628, fig. 5) correspond to his works of c. 1627-28, and cannot conceivably be dated to 1621.<sup>96</sup>

Although Stewart's theory is consistent with Lievens's ambitions to be a great history painter, the documentary and pictorial evidence does not support it. Van Dyck did not conceive of his print series until c. 1628, and the portrait of Lievens was made c. 1631/2. Stewart proposes that Vorsterman added a thin moustache in the final state of Van Dyck's portrait print of Lievens that made Lievens's appearance more consistent

---

<sup>95</sup> J. Douglas Stewart, "'Crossing the North-South Divide': The Young Lievens, Van Dyck, Rubens and Rembrandt; Connections and Influences," *Collected opinions. Essays on Netherlandish Art in Honour of Alfred Bader*, eds. Volker Manuth and Axel Rüger (London: Paul Holbertson, 2004), 195. The straight nose and rounded chin, and the very heavy eyelids differ considerably from Lievens's more youthful features in the later *Profile Self-portrait* in Copenhagen (Sum. 1258, c. 1627, Copenhagen).

<sup>96</sup> Stewart, "Before Rembrandt's 'Shadow' Fell," 42-47. Lievens published a print of it (Holl. 74), which he then modified for his 1629 *Praying Capuchin Monk* (Sum. 1238, Monteviot, fig. 43). Unlike Lievens's *tronies*, Rubens's were still closely guarded shop models. Presumably the Rubens *tronie* was itself in Antwerp c. 1620-28. If so, it is doubtful that Lievens would have been allowed to copy a *tronie* or keep his own copy of it.

with a date of c. 1631/2, when Huygens probably introduced Lievens to Van Dyck.<sup>97</sup> Writing c. 1629, however, Constantijn Huygens had described Lievens as small, and noted that both Rembrandt and Lievens were beardless (“*imberbi*”), just as Lievens painted himself around 1627 (Sum. 1258, Copenhagen), adding just such a thin moustache for the small *Self-portrait looking right* of c. 1631 (Sum. 1273, Private Collection).<sup>98</sup>

Lievens told Huygens in c. 1628/9 that he had no need to travel for training. Orlers, who lived across the street from Lievens, noted that Lievens was at home in 1621, and specifically noted that Lievens began working in Leiden immediately after returning from Lastman’s studio “...sonder eenigen anderen Meester...” (“without having any other masters”).<sup>99</sup> Lievens described to Orlers in detail his English experiences but made no mention of an early trip to Antwerp. After the resumption of hostilities with Spain in 1621, Huygens had been searching for a native artist of the caliber of Rubens capable of working for the Stadhouder, and would have been keenly sensitive to any Flemish experience in Lievens’s background. The interest shown by Lievens in the technique and models of Rubens would have been cultured by Lastman and even Van Schooten, who both produced history paintings and seem to have shaped and molded Lievens’s ambitions and directed him to seek out the greatest and most honorable commissions.

---

<sup>97</sup> Bernard Schnackenburg cautiously accepted that Lievens could have visited Antwerp, but in 1625 rather than 1620/1, although Van Dyck was in Italy at that time. Bernard Schnackenburg, “Knabe im Atelier und Bücherstube, zwei frühe Gemälde von Jan Lievens und ihr Leidener Kontext; Rembrandt, Jan Davidsz. de Heem, Pieter Codde,” *Oud Holland* 117 (2004): 35. Bernard Schackenburg, “Young Rembrandt’s ‘Rough Manner,’ A Painting Style and its Sources,” *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, exh. cat. (Kassel: Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, 2001), 106-109. J. Douglas Stewart, “Crossing the North-South Divide,” 192.

<sup>98</sup> Constantijn Huygens, “Mijn Jeugd,” *The Rembrandt Documents*, eds. Walter L. Strauss and Marjon van der Meulen (New York: Abaris, 1979), 72.

<sup>99</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 134.

Orlers also noted that Lievens “is so naerstich ende yverich geweest omme in de konst to mogen toe nemen” (“...is so industrious and diligent to advance himself in art...”), and thus would all the not more likely have kept secret an early trip to Rubens’s studio in Antwerp.<sup>100</sup>

### Lievens’s beginnings in Leiden

While up to now none of Lievens’s works have been dated to before 1624/5, he became an independent master around 1620 or 1621. Lievens’s early chronology is complicated by the fact that he did not sign any of his works until around 1625 and the first date that appears is 1627, on *Vanitas Still Life* (Sum. 1299, Heino, fig. 50). The first combination of date and monogram occurs two years later, on a work destined for the Stadhouder, *Student reading by the Light of a Turf Fire* (Sch. 116, c. 1628, lost). Constantijn Huygens wrote that the collector Nicolaas Sohier had “...diverse portraits which the artist painted some time ago, while still a pupil.”<sup>101</sup> Jan Jansz Orlers similarly wrote,

“Van den voorschreven Lasman ghescheyden wesende, heeft hy daer nae sonder eenigen anderen Meester, hem zelve ten huysse van sijn Vader onthouden, ende alle sijnen tijt met vlijt ende naersticheydt toe gebracht, met veele ende verscheyden dingen naer het leven te schilderen, daerinne hy soo geluckich geweest is, dat vele ende vercheyden Konstverstandighen, daer inn ten hoogsten verwondert waeren, ende ongeloofflicken scheen

---

<sup>100</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

<sup>101</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

dat een Jongman twaelf of weynich meer Jaren outdt sijnde, sulcx hadde kunnen doen. Ende dat meest al naer sijn eygene Ordonnantien ende Inventien.”<sup>102</sup>

(“Having left the aforementioned Lastman, he stayed at his father’s house, not having any other master after that, and spent all his time with industriousness and diligence striving to paint many and various things from life, in which he was so successful, that many connoisseurs were utterly amazed, and it appeared unbelievable that a young man, being twelve or a few more years old, had been able to do this. And most of them according to his own designs and inventions.”)<sup>103</sup>

Such comments indicate that Lievens was very industrious during this early period and produced mainly original works that won the approval of collectors.

Orlens discusses one of these early original inventions done “from life”: “Inder Jare 1621. out zijnde 14. Jaren, heeft by zjn Moeder so wel ende konstich geconterfeyt, dat yder hem daer over verwondert heeft” (“In the year 1621, being 14 years old, he painted his mother so well and skillfully that everyone was amazed by him because of it.”).<sup>104</sup> Machtelt van Noortsant must have been around 35 or 40 years old, thus unlikely the subject of old *Old Woman reading* (Sum. 1214, c. 1621-23, Philadelphia, fig. 6), but perhaps this work shows Margaretha Smunx, Lievens’s paternal grandmother who also lived in the Choorsteeg, and lived until 1639.<sup>105</sup> While this work has traditionally been dated by Sumowski and others to c. 1625, for reasons of style alone it must have been painted much earlier than the *Reading Prophetess* that he dates to the same year (Sum.

---

<sup>102</sup> Orlens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 136.

<sup>103</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>104</sup> Orlens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 136, 139.

<sup>105</sup> De Baar, 16.

1222, c. 1625, Amsterdam, fig. 7).<sup>106</sup> While the subject of these two paintings is similar, the modeling of form and compositional depth of the Rijksmuseum painting shows much greater maturity, and the still-life details display greater refinement. The model in that painting appears to be the woman known as “Rembrandt’s Mother,” Neeltgen van Zuytbrouck, who was 57 in 1625, and whom both Lievens and Rembrandt often portrayed.

The exceptionally loose and thick paint application, as De Wetering has noted, typically adds considerable texture and surface light effects to Lievens’s early works.<sup>107</sup> The *Penitent Magdalene* (Sum. 1221, c. 1621-23, Douai, fig. 8) is another early work by Lievens painted in this exceptionally audacious style of brushwork and strong color.<sup>108</sup> With her puffy eyes and broken figure, she is a detailed and highly original character study of the kind Lievens would later develop in his *tronies*. Although Lievens would abandon such heavy paint application after 1631, it was ultimately his most lasting stylistic influence on Rembrandt

Both the Philadelphia and Douai paintings represent bold and youthful attempts to bring together the most advanced styles of the day from Utrecht, Amsterdam and Haarlem, and would indeed have astonished connoisseurs in Leiden in 1621. Lievens

---

<sup>106</sup> Kurt Bauch, “Zum Werk des Jan Lievens I,” *Pantheon* 25 (1967): 161. Bauch correctly understood the painting as dating to well before 1625. *Rembrandt after three hundred years*, exh. cat. (Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 1969), 77.

<sup>107</sup> Ernst van de Wetering, *Rembrandt, the Painter at Work* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 177-178.

<sup>108</sup> Lievens’s painting in Douai is frequently compared to Hendrick ter Brugghen’s later *Melancholia* (c.1626/7, Pommersfelden), which is more refined and direct in the play of light from the candle in the painting. Ter Brugghen’s painting is too late to have inspired Lievens’s even if it were painted c. 1625, let alone 1621. Odile Delenda, *L’Iconographie de Sainte Madeleine après le Concile de Trente II* (Ph.D. diss, Paris, 1984), 315. Jacques Foucart, *Trésors des Musées du Nord de la France I*, exh. cat. (Lille: Musée des Beaux-Arts, 1972), 65-67. Françoise Baligand, *Peinture Hollandaise, Catalogue* (Douai: Musée de la Chartreuse, 1978), 38.

drew from Utrecht the large half-length figures in genre or single-figured works and adapted these traits to Lastman's love of patterns and textiles (also a reminder that Lievens's father manufactured costly textiles). Two genre paintings that will be discussed below, *The Five Senses* (Sum. 1179, c. 1623, formerly Chicago, fig. 9) and the *Backgammon Players* (Sum. 1178, c. 1623, Cape Town, fig. 11) show Lievens merging genre subjects by Buytewech and other Haarlem painters of the late 1610s with the strong light and large figure scale of the Utrecht Caravaggisti. The date of these two similar works, traditionally thought to be c. 1624/5, should be closer to that of the *Old Woman Reading*. In any case, they clearly represent a stage in Lievens's development between his earliest works and the c. 1625 *Feast of Esther* (fig. 14) that marks Lievens's renewed interest in Lastman's later style. This change occurred upon Rembrandt's return to Leiden in 1624 or 1625, and the beginning of the close working relationship between the two artists.

Three small genre paintings by Rembrandt before he studied with Lastman from 1624 to 1625 seem to furthermore reflect the influence of Lievens's *Five Senses* (fig. 9) and *The Backgammon Players* (fig. 11): *The Three Singers: the Sense of Hearing* (Bredius 421, fig. 12), *The Operation: the Tense of Touch* (Bredius 421A) and *The Spectacles Seller: the sense of sight* (RRP I, B3).<sup>109</sup> One of them, *The Spectacles Seller*, even closely imitates the composition of Lievens's *Backgammon Players*. X-radiography reveals that Rembrandt painted *The Spectacles Seller* over a female figure in the mannerist style typical of his first teacher Isaack van Swanenburg, further suggesting that these small paintings were done in the brief period between Rembrandt's three-year stint

---

<sup>109</sup> *The Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 159.



with Van Swanenburgh and the six-month period of study with Lastman in 1624 to 1625.<sup>110</sup>

Lievens's manner seems to have been a revelation for Rembrandt. In these small panels, Rembrandt's chiaroscuro, pure color, genre imagery, Caravaggism, shallow space and coarse paint handling represent a complete departure from his training with Van Swanenburg and instead imitate the bold handling of Lievens's first works. The love of textile patterns and pure color reflects his imitation of those aspects of Lastman's work that Lievens had absorbed.

Orlers testified that Lievens worked "ten huysse van zijn Vader" ("in his father's house") after he returned from Amsterdam around 1620/21 and the house on the Choorsteeg was not large.<sup>111</sup> It has been assumed by many that Lievens shared his space with Rembrandt immediately after the latter returned from Amsterdam.<sup>112</sup> As De Baar and Moerman point out, however, Rembrandt's family did not live far from the Pieterkerkschoorsteeg.<sup>113</sup> Their artistic dialogue is evident in many of their earliest works and the sharing of props, equipment and models, including each other.<sup>114</sup> In any event, when Jan Lievens's father was able to buy a larger house in 1628 on the Breestraat, Jan would have had adequate working space and no need to share a studio.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> *The Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 159.

<sup>111</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 138.

<sup>112</sup> De Baar and Moerman, 35-36.

<sup>113</sup> De Baar and Moerman, 36.

<sup>114</sup> Van de Wetering, *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 40-42.

<sup>115</sup> De Baar and Moerman, 30.

Constantijn Huygens referred to Rembrandt and Lievens as a “duo,” or pair, in his autobiography of 1629-31, suggesting that he met them at the same time and place.<sup>116</sup> By 1628, however, Rembrandt had his own pupil, Gerrit Dou, while Lievens had moved with his family into a larger house. Huygens also tells of seeing Lievens standing in a space surrounded by his own paintings, “seeing the maker beside his paintings, it is scarcely credible that a meager sapling could put forth so much fruit.”<sup>117</sup> It seems improbable that all this would fit in a single workshop. Ultimately, as Van de Wetering pointed out, the only evidence for a close working relationship lies in the fact that their works are occasionally catalogued as being by “Rembrandt or Lievens” in the inventories of the most prominent collections which their works executed prior to 1632 entered, those of Charles I and Frederik Hendrik.<sup>118</sup> The confusion of the cataloguers and connoisseurs suggests that the two artists were identified with a single style of work, as if they belonged to a common workshop.<sup>119</sup>

Several major works by Lievens, such as *Pilate washing his Hands* (Sum. 1180, Leiden, fig. 13) and *Feast of Esther* (Sum. 1181, Raleigh, fig. 14), date to c.1625. In his 1641 *Beschrijvinghe der Stadt Leyden*, Orlers writes about Lievens’s first paintings:

“In zijn Jonge Jaeren ende eenighen tijt daer naer heeft hy veele ende vercheyden stucken ende Kontefeysels gemaect, de welcke nu tegenwoordich noch in groote waerde gehouden werden: ende onder die sijn noch te vinden by de Erfgenamen van Pieter Huygen du Boys, vercheyden Konterfeysels, een Cupido met een Maers met

---

<sup>116</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 132. Huygens’s passages on Rembrandt and Lievens will be discussed in greater detail below.

<sup>117</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

<sup>118</sup> Van de Wetering, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 45, 46.

<sup>119</sup> Van de Wetering, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 45, 46.

Almanacken, om sijn hals een Tobbeken met witte hoepen, vol knollen ende andere groente, extraordinaris gehandelt. By Adriaen van Leeuwen, de vijf Sinne in een Berdt, By Ian vander Graft, een Pylatus, ende vele vercheyden andere stucken alles te lange ome te verhaelen.”<sup>120</sup>

(“In his youth and for some years thereafter, he made a large variety of paintings and portraits which are still regarded as extremely valuable. Some of them are still in the hands of the heirs of Pieter Huygen du Bois: diverse portraits, a Cupid with a satchel of almanacs and, slung round his shoulders, a cask with white hoops, filled with turnips and other vegetables, consummately rendered. Adriaen van Leeuwen has a panel with the Five Senses, Jan van der Graft a Pilate and various other pieces which are too many to enumerate.”)<sup>121</sup>

Lievens continued to copy Haarlem masters as well, as Orlers mentioned a few lines earlier,

“Omtrent dien tijd heeft hy gecopieert twee treffelicke stucken vanden uytmuntenden Schilder Mr. Cornelis Ketel van Haerlem, zijnde Democritus ende Heraclitus, Die hy soo wel gevolcht hadde, dat de Konstverstandige Lie-hebbers, tusschen de principalen ende de Copien, geen onderscheyt en conden vinden, ende zijn int sterfhuys vanden Heer Boudewijns, voor de principaelen ercocht ende naer Duytslandt versonden.”<sup>122</sup>

(“ During this time he copied two outstanding pieces by the excellent Master Cornelis Ketel of Haarlem, a Democritus and a Heraclitus. He did this so well that those with an understanding of art could not distinguish the originals from the copies. The paintings were sold as originals from the estate of Mr. Boudewijns and sent to Germany.”)<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 137.

<sup>121</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

<sup>122</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 136.

<sup>123</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 138.

Ketel's *Democritus* and *Heraklitus* were renowned and frequently copied masterpieces, and Lievens's copies would likely have been similar to his other large single-figure works (Sch. 96, c. 1621-25, lost).<sup>124</sup> The *Five Senses* belonging to Adriaen van Leeuwen survives (Sum. 1179, c. 1623, formerly Chicago, fig. 9), as does *Pilate washing his Hands* (Sum. 1180, c. 1625, Leiden, fig. 13).<sup>125</sup>

Orlers neglected to mention any of the Lievens paintings in Orlers's own collection, listed in a 1640 inventory. They included *The Four Evangelists* "done after life...on four panels," (Sum. 1230-1233, c. 1626/7, Bamberg, fig. 52), a *Boy blowing Bubbles* "after life" (Sum 1215, c. 1628, Düsseldorf, fig. 47, or Sum 1227, c. 1628, Besançon, fig. 48), as well as *The Caretaker of the Alms house holding a Skull* (cf. Sum. D 1595, c. 1635-40, Amsterdam, fig. 17).<sup>126</sup> Other works by Lievens in his collection included a "*groot inbyten*" ("large breakfast still life"), a "*Crouchgen*" ("tavern interior") and *Boeren Inbytgen* (peasant breakfast still-life).<sup>127</sup>

Lievens was also copying and emulating Rubens's work. By around 1627 he had drawn a copy (Sum. D 1638x, c. 1627/8, Vienna, fig. 4) of Rubens's *tronie* of a man (c. 1618, Vienna, fig. 3) that he then issued as a print (Holl. 74, c. 1629, fig. 5). In his private autobiography begun in 1629, Huygens mentions that Lievens's "*Sultan Soliman*" of c. 1628 (Sum. 1236, Potsdam, fig. 18) was in the collection of the Stadhouder.

---

<sup>124</sup> A painting in the collection of Radboud University, *Hippocrates visits Democritus* (Sch. 103, Nijmegen), is, as Bauch suggested, most likely by Claes Moyaert. Bauch, *Zum Werk des Jan Lievens*, 170. Schneider-Ekkart, 326. Arnold Houbraken attributed the Ketel originals to Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem, perhaps transcribing Orlers incorrectly. Arnold Houbraken, *De Groote Schouburg der Nederlantsche Konst-schilders en Schilderessen I*, (Amsterdam, 1718), 297.

<sup>125</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 138.

<sup>126</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 138. *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1626*, 17-18. The portrait of the caretaker is lost, but perhaps reflected in the drawing Sum. D. 1595, c. 1635-40, Amsterdam.

<sup>127</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 138.

Lievens based this image on the African magus in Rubens's *Adoration of the Magi* (1617/18, Lyon, fig. 19). Rembrandt, too, would later base his *Self-portrait with a Poodle* (Bredius 16, 1631, Paris) on the same figure by Rubens.<sup>128</sup> Lievens was probably familiar with Rubens's composition through Vorsterman's engraving after it. Additionally, Lievens could have seen a magnificent collection of Rubens paintings in The Hague. These had been sent by Rubens to the English ambassador Sir Dudley Carleton as part of an exchange of art.<sup>129</sup> Although it seems Lievens would have had access to Carleton's collection in The Hague, no copies or sketches of these works by his hand are known.

Orlers discusses an over-life-size painting of a *Student reading by the Light of a Turf Fire* (Sch. 116, c. 1628, lost) later in his text on Lievens:

“Eenigen tijt daer na is by hem gemaect een Beeldt so groot als tleven, op sijn hooft hebbende een ronde muts, studerende by een brandend vier van Torven, het welc zo geestich geschildert was dat zijn Hoochheyt mijn Heere den Prince van Orangnen het selfde dede coopen ende dat vereerdeaenden Ambassadeur vanden Coning van Groot Brittagnen: die het zelve wederomme gegeven heeft aen zijn Heere den Coning, ende tot Westmunster noch te sien is.”<sup>130</sup>

(“Some time later he made an image of a person as large as life with a round cap on his head, studying beside a burning turf fire, which was painted so lively that his Highness my Lord the Prince of Orange bought it and

---

<sup>128</sup> Lievens referred to Rubens's figure of the African magus again in his *Self-portrait in a Yellow Cloak* (Sum.1264, c. 1631, Edinburgh). Roelof van Straten, *Rembrandt's Leidse Tijd*, [www.foleorpublishers.com/rembrnl.htm](http://www.foleorpublishers.com/rembrnl.htm) (Accessed June 24, 2004).

<sup>129</sup> In a letter of June 1, 1618 to Carleton following the shipment, Rubens listed the paintings as: “...the Daniel, the Leopards, the Hunt, the St. Peter, the Susanna, the St. Sebastian, the Prometheus, the Leda, Sarah and Hagar”). Ruth Saunders Magurn, *The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 67.

<sup>130</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 137.

honored the Ambassador of the King of Great Britain with it, who in turn gave it to his Lord the King, and it can still be seen in Westminster.”<sup>131</sup>

This painting was of sufficient merit to be purchased by the Stadhouder Frederik Hendrik, undoubtedly on the recommendation of his artistic adviser Constantijn Huygens, and sent as a gift to Charles I of England in 1629.<sup>132</sup> At the sales of the King’s goods in 1649 this painting was acquired by Colonel William Webb but is now lost.<sup>133</sup> By 1629, Huygens had likely met Lievens and may have even been involved in the Stadhouder’s acquisition of Lievens’s “*Sultan Soliman*” (Sum. 1236, c. 1628, Potsdam, fig. 18). In his private autobiography he also found Lievens’s student work impressive enough to mention, “apud Sohierium variae neque adeo nuper a puero efformata; opera, sic autorem diu incolumem habeamus! ingentis pretii, artificiique incomparabilis.”<sup>134</sup> (“At [Nicolaas] Sohier diverse portraits which the artist painted some time ago, while still a pupil. May their maker be preserved for us in the length of days! They are works of inestimable

---

<sup>131</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>132</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 138-139.

<sup>133</sup> Lord Ancrum, Sir Robert Kerr acquired a similar painting, *Capucin Monk praying* (Sum. 1238, 1629, Monteviot, fig. 43) for his own collection as well as *Bust of an Old Woman* (Sum 2360, c. 1631, Windsor Castle, fig. 40) for the King, and as ambassador gave the lost *Student reading by a Turf Fire* (Schneider 116), recieved from Frederik Hendrik, to Charles I. Schneider, 120. John Evelyn (1620-1706) saw a work similar to *Capuchin Monk praying*, as he noted in his diary on 19<sup>th</sup> May, 1649, when he went “To see a rare cabinet of one Delabarr, who had some good paintings, especially a monk at his beads.” John Evelyn, *Diary 1620-1706* (Akron OH: Harry Dunn, 1901). *Bust of an Old Woman* (Sum. 2360, 1631, Windsor Castle), given to the King by Lord Ancrum, was until recently attributed to Rembrandt. Roelof van Straten presumes this painting was once owned by Jacques de Gheyn II and that it, with the Rembrandt self-portrait included in this gift, was an atelier copy made by Dou solely on the basis of the reused panels, but this practice was common and appears in autograph paintings by Rembrandt and Lievens, and the Windsor Castle painting must be included as an autograph Lievens. Lievens’s Brighton *Raising of Lazarus* (Sum 1191, 1631, fig. 14) and Rembrandt’s *Man in a Gorget* (RRP A8, c. 1626, Private Collection) are on similarly recycled supports, and their authenticity has never been doubted. Van Straten, *Rembrandts Leidse Tijd*.

<sup>134</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

value and unrivalled artistry.”)<sup>135</sup> Like Orlers, Huygens singles out the early portraits and student works as being especially valued by collectors, further indicating that Lievens’s oeuvre begins around 1621.

### **Constantijn Huygens and Lievens**

Constantijn Huygens, the Stadhouder’s secretary, was a renaissance man of great intellectual breadth and complexity, a prolific writer, poet, playwright, composer and diplomat. Born in The Hague in 1596, he attended Leiden University from 1616-1617 and was familiar with the city.<sup>136</sup> His father Christiaen was secretary to William the Silent and later Raad van Staat. Constantijn was, like Jan Lievens, a prodigy who composed in Latin at a young age. He could also identify with Lievens’s family background as his mother’s family was Protestant, and they had fled Antwerp. From 1620 to 1624 he traveled with the diplomat François van Aerssen, first to Venice (1620), and then to England for three years from 1621 to 1624 (he had traveled there in 1618 with Sir Dudley Carleton), where he came under the spell of John Donne, whose poetry he would translate into Dutch.<sup>137</sup> From 1625 on he served as the Stadhouder’s secretary, following in the footsteps of his father.

Huygens began his autobiography while on campaign with Frederik Hendrik on May 11, 1629, not long after Lievens’s completion of the portrait, and continued writing it

---

<sup>135</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

<sup>136</sup> G. J. van Bork and P. J. Verkruijsse, *De Nederlandse en Vlaamse auteurs* (1985), 291.

<sup>137</sup> L. Strengholt, *Constanter: Het leven van Constantijn Huygens* (Amsterdam: Querido, 1987), 32, 39-47.

until April 1631. Huygens was himself an amateur painter and wrote extensively about artists, discussing most of the major painters working in Holland as well as Rubens, whom he held in the greatest esteem. He places Rembrandt and Lievens “In Triarijs” (“in the third rank” or “in the rear guard”) because they are young, but he devotes more words to them than to any of the others. Huygens focuses on Lievens’s potential as a painter, his character and his ambition, and with great flourish wrote:

“ In Triarijs consulto reservavi nobile par adolescentium Leidensium, quos aequare solos si dixero quae in toto magnis mortalibus portenta designavi, aliquid adhuc infra merita istorum statuero; si superaturos brevi, nihil spei addidero, quam de stupendis initijs prudentissimi quique praeceperunt.”<sup>138</sup>

(“In the third rank, I have purposely singled out a noble pair of Leiden youths. If I said they alone were equal to those prodigies I have pointed out among so many great mortals, I would judge even this something less than what these two deserved. If I said they will shortly surpass them, I would leave nothing more to hope for than what certain sage observers have anticipated from their astonishing beginnings.”)<sup>139</sup>

Huygens was apparently in Leiden looking for a painter who could be as effective for the Stadhouder’s court in The Hague as Rubens and Van Dyck had been for the Archducal court in Brussels.<sup>140</sup> Huygens wrote:

“Vultus mei (quod hic obiter memorare libet), cum

---

<sup>138</sup> Strauss and van der Meulen, 68, 69.

<sup>139</sup> Strauss and van der Meulen, 68, 69. The authors of *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden* also render the first line unclearly as “I have deliberately refrained from mentioning a pair...” losing Huygens’s sense of keeping young and inexperienced soldiers in reserve.

<sup>140</sup> Schwartz, 73-77. Gary Schwartz calculated that Jan Jansz Orlers had arranged for Huygens’s “unexpected” introduction to the two young painters, dating the encounter to October 15 or 17 of 1627, an occasion when Huygens is known to have visited Leiden with his brother. Schwartz, 81. Ekkart reviews the history of the discussion of the date of this painting, and notes that stylistic evidence confirms the date to the winter of 1628 and 1629. Ekkart, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 53-56.



adhuc homini ignotus forte aliquando cum fratre  
accessissem, depingendi tantum desiderium cepit, ut,  
postquam mei copiam non invitus roganti addixissem,  
modo Hagam commeare ac domi meae deversari tantisper  
vellet, paucis post diebus advolans negaverit, se ab eo  
tempore vel dormientem quietā nocte, vel vigilem animo  
defaecato et ad studia sua idoneo usum fuisse; adeo mei  
imaginem pepetuo praesenti specie obversantem adegisse  
tandem, ut morae impatiens satiandi impetus occasionem  
amplexum iret, stupendo non nisi invitus et reluctantante genio  
adigi consuevisset.”<sup>141</sup>

(“Allow me to relate in passing that once, in the  
company of my brother, I called on him; he had no prior  
acquaintance with me at this time. He was seized with the  
desire to paint my portrait. I assured him that I should be  
only too pleased to grant him the opportunity if he would  
come to The Hague and put up at my house for a while. So  
ardent was his desire that he arrived within a few days,  
explaining that since seeing me his nights had been restless  
and his days so troubled that he had been unable to work.  
My countenance had lodged so firmly in his mind that his  
eagerness brooked no further delay. This effect on his  
imaginative power was all the more remarkable in view of  
his customary aversion to being persuaded to portray a  
person.”)<sup>142</sup>

Thus, shortly after Huygens’s first acquaintance with Lievens (“adhuc homini ignotus”),  
Lievens appeared in The Hague to paint Huygens’s portrait (Sum. 1286, 1628-29, on loan  
to Amsterdam, fig. 20). Seated in a chair and turned three-quarters to the viewer,  
Huygens looks to the left. His hands are clasped on his lap on top of his gloves. Aside  
from a touch of velvet on the chair, the portrait is almost completely monochrome, owing  
to Huygens’s pallid skin and his costume, which consists of a black hat, cloak and tunic  
and brilliant white collar and cuffs. His figure is relatively small in the picture, creating a  
diagonal across the picture plane. It forms a study in accessibility and concealment. The

---

<sup>141</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

<sup>142</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133-134.

glance away and the interlocking fingers of his folded hands distance Huygens from the viewer while the relaxed manner of the hands and the doffed gloves, as well as the three-quarter pose that projects the seated figure towards the viewer all suggest access.

Huygens gave uncommonly high praise to the resulting work: “not a day goes by but it is regarded by Mierevelt and countless other with the utmost admiration,” the court portraitist Michiel van Mierevelt (1567-1641) being the most highly esteemed Hague artist in Huygens’s survey. Huygens took special note of Lievens’s incisiveness in exposing what Huygens deliberately sought to conceal:

“...quanquam cogitabunda vultu genii mei  
alacritatem minus commode expressam aliqui causentur,  
quod, ut fatear, mihi imputandum moneo, qui circa  
tempestatem illam rei familiari seriae et gravis momenti  
implicitus, quas animo condebam curas vultu, ut fit,  
oculisque non obscure praeferebam.”<sup>143</sup>

(“There are those who opine that the contemplative rendering of the face detracts from the vivacity of my mind, to which I can but respond that the fault is mine. During this period I was involved in a serious family affair of some importance and, as is only to be expected, the cares which I endeavored to keep to myself were clearly reflected in the expression of my face and eyes.”)<sup>144</sup>

These were especially flattering words from Huygens to whom, as state secretary and diplomat, the concealing and deciphering of intentions were important skills. Huygens’s praise for Lievens’s incisiveness accords with his admiration for Lievens’s “acute and profound insight.”<sup>145</sup> Lievens repeated the profile pose in his 1631 portrait of *Prince Karl-Ludwig von der Pfalz taught by Wolrad von Plessen as Aristotle instructing the*

---

<sup>143</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

<sup>144</sup> *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 134.

<sup>145</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

*Young Alexander* (Sum. 1186, 1631, Los Angeles, fig. 76), the result of a portrait commission that clearly involved Huygens. In 1629, Huygens wrote,

“Contentus vestimenta et nudas manus, profecto elaboratissimae elegantiae, repraesentasse ac vultum usque in veris initia differre, neque um temperavit sibi, quin praefixum diem longe anticiparet.”<sup>146</sup>

(“...he was content to paint my clothes and my bare hands, a task of which he acquitted himself most tastefully, and to postpone the portrayal of my face until the advent of spring. Again, he made his appearance long before the appointed date.”)<sup>147</sup>

Thus the portrait’s creation most likely took place over the winter and possibly the early spring of 1628-29.

Identifying the serious family affair and therefore the date of the painting has proven elusive. Gary Schwartz posited that the “tempestatum” or serious family affair to which Huygens was referring was the pregnancy of his wife, Susannah van Baerle, with Constantijn Jr., born in March of 1628.<sup>148</sup> While this suggests a date of 1627-28, it places the date of the painting too close to the birth of the child. Huygens penned several epigrams about portraits of himself, and in one written August 2, 1627, *On my portrait*,

---

<sup>146</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

<sup>147</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 134. In fact x-radiography shows that the area of the face does show considerable change, from a frontal to profile pose. A. van Schendel, “Het portret van Constantijn Huygens door Jan Lievens,” *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* 11 (1963), 6, 9. This perhaps indicates that Lievens, in whom Huygens saw a reluctant portraitist, began with a conventional pose according to his training with Van Schooten, whose black manner, seen in the later portrait of Antonius Thysius (1635, Philadelphia), was retained by Lievens. The “black manner” was noted by Jacob van Campen in a letter to Huygens of July 1633, in which he offered to match Lievens’s portrait with a white one. Schwartz, 76. It is doubtful that Van Campen thought poorly of Lievens’s skill as a portraitist, since he retained him for several projects. Instead, as Julius Held interpreted Van Campen’s use of the word “black,” it seems a reference to the mood rather than the dominant color of the painting. J. S. Held, “Constantijn Huygens and Susannah van Baerle: A Hitherto Unknown Portrait,” *Art Bulletin* 73 (1991): 664ff.

<sup>148</sup> Schwartz, 81.

*made shortly before my wedding*, he writes, “Speak, painting, and say how powerful a happiness has raised me up inside, when I feared if I would win the heart of my Star...”<sup>149</sup> This epigram and another of August 7, *Still about the same one*, are usually taken to be *ekphraseis* or descriptions of Thomas de Keyser’s genre-like portrait of the secretary at work (1627, London).<sup>150</sup> Following J. A. Emmens’s 1956 analyses of Huygens’s epigrams, Ad Leerintvelt argued, in a 1990 article, that these epigrams refer to Lievens’s portrait and that the portrait then shows Huygens worrying about his marriage proposal to Susannah van Baerle (they married in February 1627).<sup>151</sup> He argues that the epigram of August 2, 1627 specifically refers to a silent portrait, thereby ruling out De Keyser’s painting in which Huygens verbally instructs his clerk. However, unlike Lievens’s painting, De Keyser’s portrait is indeed silent about Huygens’s worries, thus making it the more likely subject of the 1627 epigrams.

Ekkart, who recently confirmed that that Huygens was indeed in Leiden in October 1628 and (unusually for Huygens) in The Hague in the first months of 1629, dated the portrait to 1628-29 on stylistic grounds by comparing it to *St. Paul writing to the Thessalonians* (Sum. 1240, c. 1629, Bremen, fig. 21) and *Portrait of Rembrandt* (Sum. 1260, c. 1629, Cevat Collection, fig. 32).<sup>152</sup> Moreover, in a much later epigram

---

<sup>149</sup> The epigram is dated from July 31-August 2, 1627. Leerintvelt, 175.

<sup>150</sup> *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133-134. Huygens makes no mention in the surviving text of the portrait of him of the same year by Thomas de Keyser (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). R.E.O. Ekkart, “Rembrandt, Lievens and Constantijn Huygens,” *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 50. A. M Th. Leerintveld, “‘Tquam soo wel te pass’: Huygens’ portretbijschriften en datering van zijn portret geschilderd door Jan Lievens,” *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek VIII* (1989): 164- 165.

<sup>151</sup> J. A. Emmens, “Ay Rembrandt, maal Cornelis stem,” *Kunsthistorisch Opstellen I* (1956, Amsterdam: G.A. van Oorschot, 1981), 83-84. Leerintveld, 164, 168-170, 173.

<sup>152</sup> Ekkart pointed out the differences between the portrait and such works of 1627/8 such as *Samson and Delilah* (Sum. 1184, Amsterdam, fig. 55) and the Bamberg *Evangelists* (Sum. 1230-33, fig. 53). R. E. O. Ekkart, “Rembrandt, Lievens en Constantijn Huygens” *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 56. Sumowski,

that unquestionably discusses the Douai portrait, *In Effigiem meam, manu I. Livij* of April 5, 1632, Huygens wrote,

“Picturae nec lingua deest, ne fallere, nec vox;  
Hugeni facies haec meditantis erat.  
Si quaeras animam, spirantem quisque videbis,  
Qui attuleris qualem Liuius intuitum”<sup>153</sup>

Huygens explicitly identifies Lievens’s as the artist of the portrait and declares that, unlike the painting to which the 1627 epigrams refer, this portrait lacks neither tongue nor voice (“Picturae nec lingua deest, ne fallere, nec vox”), despite the figure’s meditative face (“Hugenij facies haec meditantis erat”), which was how he described Lievens’s portrait in his autobiography: “...the cares I endeavored to keep to myself were clearly reflected in the expression of my face and eyes.”<sup>154</sup>

Despite Lievens’s talent for portraiture, (“in painting the human countenance he brings about miracles”), Huygens noted that by 1629 it was exceptional for Lievens to paint a portrait: “[Lievens’s eagerness to paint my portrait] was all the more remarkable in view of his customary aversion to being persuaded to portray a person.”<sup>155</sup>

Uncharacteristically, the self-confident Lievens, struggled with Huygens’s pose, as has been confirmed by x-radiography.<sup>156</sup> Starting with a conventional frontal image, he arrived at a near-profile view that endowed Huygens with the reflective interiority Huygens admired. This portrait to 1628-29 establishes the beginning of Lievens’s long

---

*Gemälde III*, 1808. Schneider-Ekkart, 309.

<sup>153</sup> Leerintveld, 176.

<sup>154</sup> Huygens, in Leerintveld, 176. Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 134.

<sup>155</sup> Schneider-Ekkart, 309. Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 134.

<sup>156</sup> Van Schendel, 6, 9.

relationship with Huygens, who would become a key agent and supporter through a large part of his career.

### **A noble painter**

In his biography, Huygens praised the “noble” painters Lievens and Rembrandt as having far outstripped their teachers’ achievements.<sup>157</sup> Lievens, in fact, did not imitate Van Schooten or Lastman, but his father’s choice of these two masters, among the most accomplished and prestigious available to him, is indicative of Lievens’s early promise as an artist and likely shaped Lievens’s ambition. Lievens’s many *tronies* and large-figure history paintings show him synthesizing a wide range of the most prestigious and advanced models with what he learned from Lastman.<sup>158</sup>

Huygens contrasts the noble demeanors of the two artists to their common backgrounds: “One of my young men has an embroiderer - a commoner - for a father...” To him, their artistic genius ennobled them above their common parentage. He quips that the satirist Traianus Boccalinus (1556-1613), having observed the dissection of a nobleman’s corpse, could assert that nobility did not reside in the blood.<sup>159</sup> The teachers of Lievens and Rembrandt were also not responsible for this genius:

“Si praeceptores quaero, quibus usos pueros  
constat, vix vulgi supra laudem evector homines invenio,  
quales nempe res tenuis parentum viliore pretio tironibus

---

<sup>157</sup> Strauss and Van der Meulen, 69.

<sup>158</sup> Strauss and Van der Meulen, 72.

<sup>159</sup> Schneider, 290.

assignavit, quique, si in conspectum hodie discipulorum veniant, eodem rubore confundantur, quo confuses credo, qui ad poesin Virgilium, ad oratoram Ciceronem, ad mathesin Archimedes primi instituerant. Ut suum cuique tribuam, nec alterum laedam tamen, (mea enim quid interst?) nihil praeceptoribus debent ingenio omnia, ut, si nemine praeunte relictis olim sibi fuissent et pingendi forte impetum cepissent, eodem evasuros fuisse peruear, quo nunc, ut falso creditor, manu ducti adescenderunt.”<sup>160</sup>

(“Enquiring to their childhood teachers, I discover men whose reputation was scarcely known outside the common classes. Due to their parents’ straitened circumstances, the youths were compelled to take teachers whose fees were modest. Were these teachers to be confronted with their pupils today, they would feel just as abashed as those teachers who gave Virgil his first lessons in poetry, Cicero in rhetoric and Archimedes in mathematics. Let it however be said, with due respect for everyone’s capacities and without detracting from anyone (for what is it to me?): these two owe nothing to their teachers but everything to their aptitude. Had they never received any tuition but been left to their own devices and suddenly been seized by the urge to paint, I am convinced that they would have risen to the same heights as they indeed have. It would be wrong to think that others have led them to this point.”)<sup>161</sup>

Schwartz connects this remark to Huygens’s view of himself as a similarly self-made man.<sup>162</sup>

Ekkart takes issue with the fairness of Huygens’s remarks towards the teachers, however, and points out that Van Swanenburg and especially Van Schooten were among the most successful painters in Leiden, and that Lastman was among the most significant history painters in Amsterdam whose influence on the work of these two pupils can,

---

<sup>160</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 290.

<sup>161</sup> Huygens, in Strauss and Van der Meulen, 69.

<sup>162</sup> Schwartz, 72-73.

contrary to what Huygens indicates, repeatedly be detected, especially in the case of Rembrandt.<sup>163</sup> Wheelock notes that “Huygens’s view followed well-established literary conventions and only roughly reflected reality” with respect to Rembrandt, whose parents “...had enrolled him in Latin school at an early age.”<sup>164</sup> Lievens’s father, too, was able to provide a superior education for his children, as all of his brothers were enrolled in the same academy Rembrandt attended, and his father’s income as a tax collector allowed him to buy a larger house a short while later, in 1628.<sup>165</sup>

Huygens suggests that Lievens and Rembrandt document their works thoroughly,

“Quod de Rubenio optabam, ab his praecipue quoque, usupatum velim, opus operum suorum ut formarent, tabularum tabulam, quā, artificii sui quisque modestā mentione factā, illd omnis aevi miraculo simul et compendio demonstraret, qua ratione, quo iudicio singula contruxisset, oreinasset, elaborasset.”<sup>166</sup>

(“I am neither able nor willing to judge each according to his works and application. As in the case of the aforementioned Rubens, I wish these two would draw up an inventory of their works and describe their paintings. Each could supply a modest explanation of his method, going on to indicate how and why (for the admiration and education of all future generations) they had designed, composed and worked out each painting.”)<sup>167</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1626*, 53.

<sup>164</sup> Arthur K. Wheelock, “Rembrandt Self-Portraits: The Creation of a Myth,” *Rembrandt, Rubens and the art of their time; Recent perspectives*, eds. Roland E. Fleischer and Susan Clare Scott (University Park, PA: Penn State, 1997), 15.

<sup>165</sup> De Baar, 16.

<sup>166</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 290.

<sup>167</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 132.



Huygens's words were prescient, as Rembrandt's works were already being confused with Lievens's in the Stadhouder's inventories in 1632.<sup>168</sup> Perhaps Rembrandt and Lievens shared, at some level, the view attributed to Annibale Caracci that painters speak with their hands, that is, with art rather than words.<sup>169</sup> In any case, what Huygens had in mind was not a register of works to defeat forgers and discourage unauthorized competition, which was the function of the *Liber veritatis* by Claude Lorraine (1600 to 1682), but a description of the whole creative process, "how and why...they had designed, composed and worked out each painting."<sup>170</sup> He follows this recommendation with an invaluable summary of Lievens's character and artistic style:

“...hunc alteri inventionis et quādam audacium argumentorum formarumque superbiā. Nam et animo uivente nihil hic nisi grande et magnificentum spirans, obiectarum formarum magnitudinem non tam adaequat libenter quam exsuperat...”<sup>171</sup>

“[Lievens] is the greater in inventiveness and audacious themes and forms. Everything his young spirit endeavors to capture must be magnificent and lofty. Rather than depicting his subject in its true size, he chooses a larger scale.”<sup>172</sup>

Huygens cites several of Lievens's paintings that he knows in great collections:

“Principem meum Turcici quasi ducis effigies ad Batavi cuiuspian caput expresa; est apud Brouartium senilis, quasi philosophi, et rugata facies; apud Gheinium

---

<sup>168</sup> Strauss and Van der Meulen, 87.

<sup>169</sup> “Noi altri Dipintori habbiamo da parlare con le mani.” A.W.A. Boschloo, *Annibale Carracci in Bologna* (The Hague: Government Printing Office, 1974), 51.

<sup>170</sup> Anthony Blunt, *Art and Architecture in France 1500-1700* (London: Penguin, 1953), 196.

<sup>171</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

<sup>172</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 132.

iuvenilis, ni fallor, una atque altera; apud Sohierium varieae neque adeo nuper a puero eformatae...<sup>173</sup>

(“In the collection of our Prince is a painting of a man purported to be a Turkish potentate with a Dutchman’s head; Brouart has a portrait whose face is wrinkled like that of a philosopher. De Gheyn, I believe, has some portraits of youths, and [Nicolaas] Sohier diverse portraits which the artist painted some time ago, while still a pupil.”)<sup>174</sup>

Apparently Lievens’s success at court preceded his meeting Huygens since three of his paintings were, as Schwartz noted, already in the hands of court officials and one in the collection of the Stadhouder. This painting, the “Turkish potentate,” must be the *tronie* today (erroneously) called “*Sultan Soliman*” (Sum. 1236, c. 1628, Potsdam, fig. 18). At 134 cm. tall it exemplifies what Huygens said about Lievens’s over life-size scale.<sup>175</sup> Huygens was, therefore, likely the source of the inscription on Van Dyck’s c. 1631/2 portrait print of Lievens, “*Pictor humanarum figurarum maiorum Lugduni Battavorum*” which identified him as a Leiden painter of large human figures.<sup>176</sup>

Whereas Lievens’s painted half-length figures in the mid-1620s in *Pilate washing his Hands* (Sum. 1180, c. 1625, Leiden, fig. 13) and *Feast of Esther* (Sum. 1181, c. 1625,

---

<sup>173</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

<sup>174</sup> Thomas Brouart was Frederik Hendrik’s treasurer in 1631, when Huygens was writing. The description could apply to any number of Lievens’s *tronies* of old men. Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133. The heads of youths listed in Jacques de Gheyn III’s inventory could include *Young Girl with Long Hair* (Sum. 1275, c. 1630-31, Leipzig) or possibly *Young Woman and Old Woman*, listed in Jacques de Gheyn’s inventory as *Vertumnus and Pomona* (Sum. 1188, c. 1631, formerly Berlin). *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings I* (Amsterdam: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982), 165. Nicolaas Sohier was tax collector in Amsterdam. Schwartz, 76.

<sup>175</sup> “*Sultan Soliman*” was listed in the first inventory of Honselaarsdijk Palace in 1707. Gutbrod, 51. De Baar and Moerman, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 36-37. Over-life-size figure paintings by Lievens frequently appear in Leiden inventories. C. Willemijn Fock, “Kunstbezit in Leiden in de 17de eeuw,” *Het Rapenburg. Geschiedenis van een Leidse gracht V* (Leiden: Afdeling Geschiedenis van de Kunstnijverheid Rijksuniversiteit, 1990), 3-36.

<sup>176</sup> Lucas Vorsterman after Anthony van Dyck, *Portrait of Jan Lievens*, (Holl. XLIII, Nr. 174). Gutbrod, 54.

Raleigh, fig. 14), in works on paper of the same period he used small-scale full-length figures (*Mucius Scaevola*, fig. 22, *The Feast of Esther*, fig. 15 and *Stoning of St. Paul*, fig. 23). He also published prints with comparably scaled figures around 1626 such as *St. John on Patmos* (Holl. 9, fig. 24) with Jan Pietersz Berendrecht in Haarlem, and *Esau denied Isaac's Blessing* (Sum. 1182, c. 1626, fig. 25) and *Susannah and the Elders* (Sum. 1183, c. 1626, fig. 26) with Jan Joris van Vliet. Lievens then utilizes this small-figured mode in painting around 1630 in such works as *Interior with a Priest writing* (Sum. 1241, c. 1630/1, Krakow) and *Raising of Lazarus* (Sum. 1193, 1631, Brighton, fig. 66). The large-figure style that Huygens identified of around 1628 (*Samson and Delilah*, Sum. 1185, c. 1628, Amsterdam, fig. 56) and that reflected the influence of Rubens, gave way to the smaller-figured works in the style that Lievens developed with Rembrandt.

### **Lievens's personality**

In 1629, Huygens noted that Lievens aspired to “loftiness” (“magnificum spirans”) in his work, and this aspiration remains a constant goal in Lievens's work for the rest of his career. The erudite scholar and humanist Huygens was even more effusive on the subject of Lievens's intelligence and personality:

“De Livio supra in transcursu praefatus satis indicasse videor, quo caractere sit: magni animi puer et, si vitalis fuerit, a quo nescio quid non summi expectandum. Iudicio pollet in re quālibet acri, profundo et supra virilitatem maturo, cuius inter confabulandum periculo non semel facto unum illud improbare soleo, quod, nimiā quādam sui fiduciā rigidum, reprehensionem omnem aut plane recuset, aut admissam aegre patiat; vitio, omni quidem aetati magnopere noxio, adolescentiae vere pernicioso, ut fere μικρα ζυμη όλον το φυγραμα ζυμοι, et

qui huic vicini vitio tenentur ενεργητως, in sacris dicuntur  
ἐαυτους φρεναπαταν. Magnum spaientiae compendiu fecit,  
qui, tribuisse cuique deum ratus, parcā quod satis est manu,  
omnium vere neminem compotem extitisse, cuivus mollem  
animum atque ingenium docile submittens, a nemine non  
doceri aliquid posse persuasum habet. ”<sup>177</sup>

(“I believe I have already mentioned Lievens’s  
character in passing. He is a young man of great spirit, and  
great things may be expected of him if he is granted a long  
enough life. He has an acute and profound insight into all  
manner of things, riper than a mature man, as I have often  
had occasion to note in conversation. My only objection is  
his stubbornness, which derives from an excess of self-  
confidence. He either roundly rejects all criticism, or, if he  
acknowledges its validity, takes it in bad spirit. This bad  
habit, harmful at any age, is absolutely pernicious in youth.  
After all, a little leaven leavens the whole lump.<sup>178</sup> And  
those ridden with the vice which closely resembles this  
habit ‘deceive themselves’, according to the Holy  
Scripture.”)<sup>179</sup>

This comment is remarkable considering Lievens began training with Joris van Schooten when he was eight and began working immediately after returning from Lastman’s studio in Amsterdam, meaning that he must have had very little formal schooling. However, Huygens’s assessments of Lievens’s judgment as incisive (“acri”), deep (“profundo”) and mature beyond most men (“supra virilitatem maturo”) are consistent with Lievens’s precociousness, his contact with educated siblings and students of the academy, and his apprenticeship to the worldly, well-traveled and experienced painter Pieter Lastman. They also reflect Lievens’s maturity after several years of experience as a master painter.

The admonition Huygens subsequently levies against Lievens’s excessive self-

---

<sup>177</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

<sup>178</sup> Galatians 5:9

<sup>179</sup> Galatians 6:3. Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

confidence and rejection of criticism is eloquent and prophetic, but also somewhat self-serving since the young artists clearly disagreed with Huygens's advice on many counts. He was not incorrect, however. Lievens did not closely follow his teachers' styles, but confidently went his own way. He was proud of his skill and originality, and his work showed that he certainly shared Huygens's admiration for Rubens, "one of the wonders of the world, experienced in all knowledge."<sup>180</sup>

The testimony of Sir Robert Kerr in a letter of 1654 to his son on the topic of the portrait Lievens made of him (Sum. 1294, 1654, Edinburgh, fig. 180) reads as follows: "he has so high a conceitt of himself that he thinks there is none to be compared with him in all Germany, Holland, nor the rest of the 17 provinces."<sup>181</sup> This account is scarcely different from that of Huygens around 1631 ("My only objection is his stubbornness, which derives from an excess of self-confidence").<sup>182</sup> Lievens's self-confidence, seen at times as overweening and grandiose, seems to be related to his wandering and acquisitive nature, constantly searching for great patrons and opportunities to paint the most lofty and magnificent commissions and subjects, constantly assimilating, shaping and forming his art to match his goals and conform to his self-image. This self-confidence and roving ambition express themselves even in minor genres like *tronies*, portraiture and, after 1632, landscape.

On Lievens's portraiture Huygens wrote,

---

<sup>180</sup> Despite Huygens's advice to concentrate on portraiture, Lievens also started producing history paintings such as *Christ on the Cross* (Sum. 1245, 1631, Nancy, fig. 59), competing for a commission from the Stadhouder, as Schwartz has noted. Schwartz, 81. Constantijn Huygens, *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huygens door hemzelf beschreven*, A.H. Kan, trans. (Rotterdam: Ad. Donker, 1971), 73.

<sup>181</sup> Lord Ancrum, in John M. Gray, *Notes on the art treasures of New-Battle Abbey* (Midlothian: 1887), 12. Schneider-Ekkart, 303.

<sup>182</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

“Exprimendis vultibus ad miraculum ivit et, si fraenari grandis ille atque indomitus ingenii impetus posit, qui spe nunc et audaciā naturam omnem amplectavit, nihil iniqui suaserit, qui, ut huic potissimum parti, tanquam totius hominis, corporis, in quam, animique mirabili compendio incumbat, autor sit. In histories enim, ut vultu loquimur, summus utique et mirandus artifex vividam Rembrandtii inventionem non facile assequetur.”<sup>183</sup>

(“In painting the human countenance he wreaks miracles. One would be rendering him good service by endeavoring to curb his vigorous, untameable spirit whose bold ambition is to embrace all of nature, and by persuading the brilliant painter to concentrate on that physical part which miraculously combines the essence of the human spirit and body. In what we are accustomed to calling history pieces, the artist, his astonishing talent notwithstanding, is unlikely to match Rembrandt’s vivid invention.”)<sup>184</sup>

Huygens acted on this latter judgment when, in 1632, he recommended that the Stadhouder award Rembrandt the commission for a series of paintings on the Passion of Christ.<sup>185</sup> Simultaneously, however, he directed the Bohemian court of Ferdinand V and Elisabeth, the Winter King and Queen, to commission from Lievens an *portrait historiée* of *Prince Karl-Ludwig von der Pfalz taught by Wolrad von Plessen as the young Alexander being instructed by Aristotle* (Sum.1186, 1631, Los Angeles, fig. 76). The existence of a “competing” portrait of *Prince Rupert of the Palatinate and his Tutor as*

---

<sup>183</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

<sup>184</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

<sup>185</sup> Rembrandt: *Raising of the Cross* (Bredius 548, c. 1633, Munich), *Descent from the Cross* (Bredius 550, c. 1633, Munich), *Ascension of Christ* (Bredius 557, 1636, Munich), *Entombment of Christ* (Bredius 560, 1639, Munich), *Resurrection of Christ* (Bredius 561, 1639, Munich). Schwartz, 107-118. Horst Gerson, *Seven Letters by Rembrandt*, Yda D. Ovink, trans. (The Hague: L. J. C. Boucher, 1961), 8. *The Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 331.

*Eli instructing Samuel* (Sum. 244, c. 1631, Los Angeles, fig. 77), completed largely by Rembrandt's workshop, suggests that Huygens put into action the rhetoric of comparison and competition he used in describing Lievens and Rembrandt in his autobiography.<sup>186</sup>

### **Huygens, Orlers and Angel**

Orlers's *Beschrijvinge* was published in 1641, just after Lievens had briefly visited Leiden from Antwerp concerning a civic commission in the town hall, the *Scipio Africanus* (Schn.106, 1639-40, destroyed 1929, fig. 106).<sup>187</sup> It seems that Orlers had contact with Lievens around this time.<sup>188</sup> Orlers's biography was part of an attempt to revive art and promote the University town and Counter-Remonstrant bastion of Leiden by bringing Lievens back, along with his new, international or Flemish-style art, to augment the art of Dou that brought the city such luster.

The painter Philips Angel had a different motive in composing his *Lof der Schilderkunst*, a speech he gave at the 1641 annual feast day of the painter's association in Leiden and published in 1642. Angel's *Lof* is well known for its information about Rembrandt and its assessment of the importance of art to his city.<sup>189</sup> It was a defense of painting as a learned art worthy of civic protection, a kind of petition for a guild to effectively glorify the city and protect its painters. Angel also discusses Lievens, and

---

<sup>186</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 132.

<sup>187</sup> De Baar and Moerman, 26.

<sup>188</sup> De Baar, 17.

<sup>189</sup> Eric Jan Sluijter, *De lof der schilderkunst. Over schilderijen van Gerrit Dou (1613-1675) en een traktaat van Philips Angel uit 1642* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1993).

focuses on the artist's choice of subject matter. His chapter "The Eighth Principle of Art" begins: "There must also be a no less practiced knowledge of the histories in order to avoid the mistake in depiction often made by the inexperienced through their careless neglect of reading."<sup>190</sup> To Angel, Lievens distinguished himself in iconography, an aspect of his art he learned from Lastman. Angel described Lievens's painting of *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* (Sum. 1195, c. 1636, Castle Howard, fig. 98), as showing Abraham embracing his son Isaac in front of the burning sacrifice of the ram, an event mentioned by Josephus but not in Genesis.<sup>191</sup> Angel lauded Lievens for using not just the Bible, but also a variety of historical sources for his paintings.<sup>192</sup>

Angel also explained how Lievens interpreted, in very human terms, the Old Testament story of David and Bethsheba (II Samuel 11:4) in his *Bathsheba receiving King David's Letter* (Sch. 15, before 1642, lost):

"Soo heeft deze wijdt-vermaerde Gheest tot verçieringhe van syn werck, treffelijcke na-ghedachten ghehad: Eerstelijck overleydt hebbende, sonder twijffel, na het uytwijzen der ordonnantie, dat sulck een Bode zy gheweest een oude, ende wel-ervaren Vrouwe in de Minnekunst ofte een Koppelerse, soo men die noemt, na dien men de sulcken ghemeenlick daertoe ghebruyct, die niet alleenlijck de boodschap simpelick met de mondt gedaen heeft, maer heeft sonder twijffel een Brief (tot bewys van meerder macht) mede gebracht, ende die aen Beth-seba benadicht, waer in hy wederom syn soete

---

<sup>190</sup> Miedema, 200.

<sup>191</sup> Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews* I: 13, in *The Works of Josephus, complete and unabridged*, trans William Whiston (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1987). Lievens must have brought this small painting (33 x 29 cm.) with him from Antwerp to Leiden in 1639 for Angel to have seen it before 1642. Lievens possibly sold the Castle Howard painting to Rembrandt at that point, since Rembrandt's 1656 inventory included "een Abrahams offerhande van Jan Lievens". Ed de Heer, ed., *Rembrandt's Schatkamer*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rembrandthuis, 1999), 148.

<sup>192</sup> Angel, 247. Sluijter describes Angels's erudition as "flinterdun" (thin as flint) and points out how Jacob Cats's use of irony and scant praise seems to elude Angel. Lievens's *Moses trampling the Crown of Pharoah* (Sum 1201, c. 1639, Lille, fig. 110) is also derived from a narrative in Josephus. Sluijter, 19.



bedenckinghe die hy hierover heeft gehad, te kennen ghegheven heeft, door dien hy (al wasser weynich) een soet blos van eerbare schaemte in haer liet ontsteecken, door ‘t leesen vanden Brief.’<sup>193</sup>

(“So this far-famed spirit reflected well on the adornment of his work. First he no doubt considered, after arranging the composition, that such a messenger would be an old woman well versed in the art of love, namely a procuress, as she is called, for which purpose such people are commonly used, who communicated the message not just in words but doubtless also brought a letter (as a token of a greater authority), which she handed to Bathsheba. In it he again showed the sweet thoughts he had had about this, by having the reading of the letter arouse a sweet blush of honorable shame in her (even if only slightly).”)<sup>194</sup>

Not only did Lievens depict Bathsheba blushing at reading King David’s letter, he also added Cupid to symbolize Bathsheba’s rising passion:<sup>195</sup>

“...daerom berooft hy het weerelt beroerende Kindt (dat hy boven in de Lucht geshict had) van syn ghewoonelijcke pijlen, latende het Wicht in plaetse van een stalen flits, met een vyerigeyverpijl op het wijfschieten, van de welck een dunne roock uyt-ginck, wa door men syn teere ledemens soetelick sach wemelen.”<sup>196</sup>

(“...deprived the world-stirring child (whom he placed high up in the sky) of his usual arrows, letting the creature

---

<sup>193</sup> Angel, in Schneider, 295. This large painting measured 200 x 160 cm. Schneider, 95. Eric Jan Sluijter interprets the mirror in Lievens’s painting (Sum. 1189, c. 1631, Studio City, CA) as emblematic of Bathsheba reflecting on the adultery she will commit. Eric Jan Sluijter, “Rembrandt’s Bathsheba and the Conventions of a Seductive Theme,” *Bathsheba Reading King David’s Letter*, Ann Jensen Adams, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 56, 85.

<sup>194</sup> Angel, Hoyle, trans., 246.

<sup>195</sup> Sluijter, “Rembrandt’s Bathsheba,” 56. Houbraken, however, abhorred this detail in Lievens’s painting for its lack of believability and criticized Angel, “But here our writer [Angel] is mistaken, if he praises this...addition. Considering that this is a symbolic reference to the rousing of passion in the King’s heart, which is never encountered in the Biblical material. But it always goes as Junius says, Painters and Poets are driven by a common urge often seeking to undertake something new.” Houbraken I, 296.

<sup>196</sup> Angel, in Schneider, 295.

dispatch a fiery arrow at the woman instead of an iron arrowhead, which trailed a thin plume of smoke through which one saw his tender limbs sweetly flutter.”<sup>197</sup>

The painting Angel described probably resembled the *Bathsheba reading David's Letter* (without a Cupid) in the Cooney Collection (Sum 1189, c. 1631, Studio City, CA, fig. 27). Angel's text indicates that in 1642 Lievens had established a reputation as a learned history painter to whom "...all these niceties flow from the fountain of the desire to read." Orlers praised Lievens's iconographic inventiveness, citing the peculiar *Cupid* allegory owned by the heirs of Pieter Huygen du Bois (Sch. 129a, lost) with its basket of almanacs and vegetables.<sup>198</sup>

### Lievens's self-portraits

In his diary Huygens is specific on the issue of the individual character and personalities of Rembrandt and Lievens. His passages reflect Lievens's burgeoning ambition and prodigious talent:

“...inventionis et quādam audacium argumentorum formarumque superbiā. Nam eet animo iuvenile nihil hic nisi grande et magnificum spirans, obiectarum formarum magnitudinem non tam adaequat libener quem excuperat”<sup>199</sup>

(“Lievens is the greater [than Rembrandt] in inventiveness and audacious themes and forms. Everything his young spirit endeavours to capture must be magnificent and lofty.

---

<sup>197</sup> Angel, Hoyle, trans., 246.

<sup>198</sup> Meidema, 200. Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 132. Orlers, in Schneider, 294. Schneider, 304.

<sup>199</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 290.

Rather than depicting his subject in its true size, he chooses a larger scale.”)<sup>200</sup>

Huygens continues that Lievens was “a young man of great spirit,” (“*magni animi puer*”) and great self-confidence (“*fiduciā*”).<sup>201</sup> Although Huygens does not comment directly on Lievens’s self-portraits, his observations largely agree with how Lievens portrayed himself in four early self-portraits: *Self-portrait in a Gorget* (Sum. 2124, c. 1626-7, unknown, fig. 29), *Profile Self-portrait* (Sum. 1258, c. 1627, Copenhagen, fig. 30), *Self-portrait looking right*, (Sum 1273, c. 1631, Private Collection, fig. 31) and the grand *Self-portrait in Yellow Cloak* (Sum. 1264, c. 1631, Edinburgh, fig. 33), an ambitious work in which the splendidly dressed artist appears aloof, high-minded and self-confident, much as Huygens described him.<sup>202</sup> While Lievens’s four self-portraits show the same experimentation with light, expression and pose share as Rembrandt’s first four or five painted self-portraits. Lievens’s poses are less dramatic, theatrical or satirical than Rembrandt’s and are instead more formal and self-controlled.

### ***Self-portrait in a Gorget, Profile self-portrait and Self-portrait looking right***

The incisiveness and energy of Lievens’s first self-portrait painting, *Self-Portrait in a Gorget* of 1626-27 (Sum. 2124, location unknown, fig. 29) is in sharp contrast to the

---

<sup>200</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 132.

<sup>201</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

<sup>202</sup> Sumowski identified the figure in *Self-Portrait in a Gorget* (Sum. 2124, fig. 29) as Lievens, pointing to the similarity of this figure to the Edinburgh self-portrait. Sumowski, *Gemälde V*, 3109. Gutbrod rejects *Self-Portrait in a Gorget* as a work of Lievens, citing its wooden and waxen form (“one sees the clear line that marks out the left cheek”), based on the black-and-white photo in Sumowski, without reference to the color reproduction in Christie’s catalog in which Lievens’s style is clearly recognizable. Gutbrod, 187.

meditative expression of the slightly later *Profile Self-Portrait* (Sum. 1258, c. 1627, Copenhagen, fig. 30). Lievens poses as an anonymous soldier rather than as an artist, suggesting the self-modeling and role-playing in historical costume that would be part of a history or genre painter's workshop practice.<sup>203</sup> Lievens wears the identical gorget that appears in his later portrait of Rembrandt (Sum. 1260, c. 1629, Cevaat Collection, on loan to Amsterdam, fig. 32), in Rembrandt's self-portrait of c. 1629 (Bredius 6, The Hague), as well as in other *tronies* by both artists. The strong light that shades the subject's eyes, although comparable to that in *Boy blowing Coals* (Sum. 1226, c. 1625, Warsaw, fig. 45), is here used for psychological as much as dramatic intent.

*Profile Self-Portrait* of c. 1627 in Copenhagen is one of the boldest of the many self-portraits in partial light made by either Rembrandt or Lievens while in Leiden (fig. 30).<sup>204</sup> Light streams from below across Lievens's back, neck and face, evocatively illuminating the tip of his nose but only partially reaching his eye and chin, and daringly leaving part of his eye and his forehead in complete shadow.<sup>205</sup> For a self-portrait, the pose was itself a difficult technical feat requiring exceptional concentration and the use of two mirrors (one reflecting the side of the head from the other).<sup>206</sup>

---

<sup>203</sup> See, for example, how Lievens posed for the elaborately costumed harpist in Rembrandt's 1626 *Musical Company* (Bredius 632, Amsterdam, fig. 28).

<sup>204</sup> Rembrandt's earliest painted self-portrait employs a very similar chiaroscuro to the Copenhagen panel, a use of light that will evolve in Rembrandt's work to become identified with his style and school (RRP A 14, c. 1628, Amsterdam). Benjamin Binstock points to Alberti's self-portrait medal as an important precedent, and to the shaded eyes as a possible reference to Melancholy. It is not likely that Lievens could have known the Alberti medal, however. Benjamin Binstock, *Becoming Rembrandt: National Religious and Sexual Identity in Rembrandt's History Paintings* (Ph. D. diss. Columbia University, 1997), 133.

<sup>205</sup> The pose and dramatic, directional lighting appear again in Lievens's contemporaneous *Young man with a Gorget* (Sum. 1256, c. 1627, Dresden, fig. 39). Lievens uses the same chiaroscuro in *Young man in baret* (Sum. 1257, c. 1626-27, Raleigh).

<sup>206</sup> Hans-Joachim Raupp, *Untersuchungen zu Künstlerbildnis und Künstlerdarstellung in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhundert* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1984), 200-204. On the use of mirrors, see Raupp, 302-304, and

Lievens's Copenhagen *Profile Self-Portrait* of about 1627 is, at 52 x 40.5 cm., over twice as large as Rembrandt's first self-portrait (22.5 x 18.6 cm, A 14, c. 1628, Amsterdam), a difference that corresponds to Huygens's observations about their respective preferred format as it related to their personalities and artistic ambitions.<sup>207</sup> Lievens's classicising profile pose seems to emulate those on antique coins and reliefs, as well as those in works by Rubens, Honthorst and the Haarlem "classicists" Salomon de Bray and Pieter de Grebber.<sup>208</sup> Lievens used the pose to project the reserved and dignified tone he so often sought in his *tronies* and history paintings.<sup>209</sup>

A third smaller self-portrait (Sumowski 1273, c. 1631, Private Collection, fig. 31) on panel (42 x 33 cm) has traditionally been dated to either Lievens's English or Antwerp period because of its soft lighting and atmospheric style. Dendrochronological analysis, however, has all but ruled out these possibilities and forced a reconsideration and re-dating to Lievens's Leiden period, most probably in or after 1630-1631.<sup>210</sup> It shows a

---

on the mainly moralizing significance of mirrors in such portraits, see Raupp, 306-308. In Pieter van Laer's *Self-Portrait* the artist uses the profile pose to fully display his over-size nose, a comic effect very different from what Lievens sought (c. 1626-30, Rome, Galleria Pallavicini).

<sup>207</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 132.

<sup>208</sup> Although Rembrandt did on occasion produce profile portraits (most notably of Amalia van Solms) and *tronies* (he even reproduced Lievens's *tronie* etchings of heads in profile), Lievens's employment of the profile was more extensive, including a number of *tronies*. Cf. Sum. 1252 (c. 1625/6, Vienna), Sum. 1249 (c. 1625/6, formerly London), Sum. 1255 (c. 1627, Dublin), Sum. 1257 (c. 1627, Raleigh NC) and Sum. 1256 (c. 1627, Dresden).

<sup>209</sup> Lievens does not include any of the accepted attributes of melancholia such as those found in Durer's print of 1514. The most popular attribute seems to have been the gesture of holding one's head, seen in self-portraits by Helmbreker and Cornelis de Bisschop (c. 1670-74, Hamburg) that also use the shaded eyes to enhance the brooding sentiment of the artist. Raupp, 226 ff, figs. 134, 136. Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 132. Binstock, 134. Schneider, 147-148.

<sup>210</sup> Ernst van de Wetering, "Rembrandt's Beginnings-an essay," *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rembrandthuis, 2001), 56 n. 76. According to Peter Klein's analysis, the panel originated from the same tree as Rembrandt's 1629 *Samson and Delilah* in Berlin (falsely dated 1628).

bust-length figure that anticipates the frontal pose and sideways glance of the *Self-Portrait in a Yellow Cloak* (Sum. 1260, c. 1631, Edinburgh, fig. 33). Lievens emphasized the high cheekbones, angled eyebrows and the dashing long hair, and he included the thin moustache that Vorsterman would later add to Van Dyck's portrait of Lievens (c. 1631, fig. 2). Most importantly, the diffuse light and loose handling of details like the hair and torso are seen in Lievens's portrait of Rembrandt (Sum. 1260, c. 1630, on loan to Amsterdam, fig. 32); thus the two portraits likely date to the same period. The vanity and air of self-confidence of this self-portrait are entirely in keeping with the testimony of Huygens about Lievens's character.

### ***Self-portrait in a Yellow Cloak***

In his three-quarter length self-portrait in Edinburgh (Sum. 1264, c. 1631, fig. 33), Lievens posed strong and aloof, in a gorget and splendid golden-colored cloak whose glow dominates the work. In this asymmetrical composition, Lievens positioned his body to the right with his arm stretched out to the left, his hand leaning on a baton in a gesture of command and ease. His index finger nearly touches the edge of the canvas as the edge of his cloak does to the right, emphasizing the flatness of the picture plane. Although his face is frontal, Lievens averts his glance to the left, imposing a psychological distance from the viewer. The portrait is a display of Lievens's command of dramatic chiaroscuro. As in the Copenhagen composition, the light in Lievens's Edinburgh self-portrait comes from the lower left, leaving strong shadows across the face.

The inspiration for the Lievens's figure, pose, gaze and even lighting seems to be that of the African magus in Rubens's *Adoration of the Magi* (1617/18, Lyon, fig. 19), a pose that Rembrandt even more explicitly imitated in his *Self-Portrait with a Poodle* (because of the addition of oriental costume), as mentioned above.<sup>211</sup> Lievens, who had already referred to this magus in the figure of "Sultan Soliman" of c. 1628 (Sum. 1236, Potsdam, fig. 18) for Frederik Hendrik, was probably familiar with Rubens's composition through a copy of Vorsterman's engraving after it (see fig. 19).<sup>212</sup>

The rich yellow cloak in the Edinburgh *Self-portrait* is also worn by the young prince in Lievens's *portrait historiée* of *Prince Karl-Ludwig von der Pfalz taught by Wolrad von Plessen*, commissioned by Elisabeth, Queen of Bohemia (Sum. 1186, 1631, Los Angeles, fig. 76). The cloak's regal allusions reinforce the commanding character of the gesture and pose Lievens himself assumes, as does the commander's baton and the military gorget.

The four self-portraits by Lievens painted in Leiden convey the incisiveness the artist showed in his portrait of Constantijn Huygens (Sum. 1286, 1628/29, on loan to Amsterdam, fig. 20) as he developed towards a portrait ideal of somber dignity.<sup>213</sup> Lievens seems to have inspired Rembrandt to paint many self-portraits but held to a different direction than Rembrandt. In these self-portraits Lievens projects his identity as

---

<sup>211</sup> Rembrandt's *Self-Portrait with a Poodle* (Bredius 16, 1631, Paris), done the same year, is otherwise a very different composition of an exotic and orientalizing turbaned figure with an almost Eyckian *repoussoir* of an obedient dog in the foreground. For Rembrandt too, the sideways glance, unique in his self-portraits, carries a sense of distance and authority. The difference in support size, however, is typical, with Rembrandt's painting 66 cm tall, to Lievens's 112 cm.

<sup>212</sup> Roelof van Straten, *Rembrandt's Leidse Tijd*.

<sup>213</sup> Gutbrod sees Lievens's self-portraits as examples of artistic competence and emotional detachment, but her group includes Rembrandt's *Self-portrait* in Atami (RRP A22, c. 1629). Gutbrod, 208-09.

a daring and experimental artist but at the same time one who is ambitious and self-confident. He uses splendid costumes and strikes formal poses that exude grandeur, ease, and even aloofness and form a contrast to Rembrandt's more self-deprecating early self-portraits, whose expressions range from laughter to scorn.<sup>214</sup>

### **Lievens's *tronies***

The largest and most stylistically consistent group of surviving paintings in Lievens's Leiden period oeuvre are the *tronies* (or genre heads) that appear to be figure or head studies. Such works account for forty-nine of the Lievens's hundred and fifty-eight paintings as catalogued by Sumowski. The production of *tronies* seems to have begun with Frans Floris in the mid-sixteenth century.<sup>215</sup> These were bust-length studies of anonymous figures adaptable to a wide range of identities, rather than figures with fixed identities such as apostles or saints carrying attributes and were used as studio models. Sixteenth-century *tronies*, like those by Floris, were generally used as models for figures in larger compositions. Painted models could be repeated in a variety of poses and identities in finished compositions, and Hoogstraten records Lievens using such unfinished figure paintings in exactly this way.<sup>216</sup> Like a medieval pattern-book, such studio models were typically not finished works of art and were guarded like trade

---

<sup>214</sup> H. Perry Chapman and Jorge Wadum, "Rembrandt under the Skin. The Mauritshuis *Portrait of Rembrandt with Gorget* in Retrospect," *Oud Holland* 114 (2000): 178-179.

<sup>215</sup> Frans Floris I, *Head of a Woman*, Milan.

<sup>216</sup> Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding tot de Hooge Schoole de Schilderkonst; anders de Zichtbare Werelt* (Rotterdam, 1678), 315, in Schneider, 300-301.



secrets. With their coarsely brushed backgrounds and generic subjects, Lievens's *tronies* have the unfinished look of such models.<sup>217</sup> *Tronies* were also used to train pupils to paint consistently in the style of the master. They were thus original, masterful and stylistically typical figures, but traditionally they were not made for the market.

These *tronies* in a painter's oeuvre announced an artist's ambitions and identified him as a history painter. Rembrandt and Lievens, however, developed the *tronie* from its original status as a shop study head (and a scarce commodity) into an independent work of art produced for the open market. Rembrandt and Lievens made numerous *tronies*, which were widely collected. Lievens used a few of his *tronies* as models in his large finished history paintings: for instance, *Bearded Old Man* formerly in Schwerin (Sum 1269, c. 1631, fig. 34), is nearly identical to the head of Job in *Job on the Dung Heap* (Sum 1191, 1631, Ottawa, fig. 28), and he used a *Bearded Old Man in profile, facing left* (Sum 2366, c. 1636, formerly Paris, fig. 35) as the model for Abraham in the Braunschweig *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* (Sum 1199, c. 1636, fig. 99). Lievens's *tronies*, including those used in larger history paintings, were independent works sold on the open market.

*Tronies* adhere to the pattern established by their origins as anonymous and malleable shop models and do not assume specific roles corresponding to figures in history or genre paintings.<sup>218</sup> *Tronies* look sometimes like portraits and self-portraits (and in the costumed self-portraits there seems to be overlap), but however much delight

---

<sup>217</sup> Lyckle de Vries, "Tronies and other single-figure Netherlandish paintings," *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 8 (1990): 190.

<sup>218</sup> Dagmar Hirschfelder, "Portrait or Character Head? The Term *Tronie* and its meaning in the Seventeenth Century," *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 82-86. De Vries, 192.

collectors took in identifying the model, *tronies* were intended to be of anonymous types. The ambiguity that gave connoisseurs such delight is marked in the terminology they used to discuss them. As Roelof van Straten and others have noted, when Constantijn Huygens refers to “effigies” in his autobiography, he means at times portraits and at others *tronies*. For example, Huygens recalls:

“Est apud Principem meum Turcici quasi ducis effigies ad Batavi cuius iam caput expressa; est apud Brouartium senilis, quasi philosophi, et rugata facies; apud Gheinium iuvenilis, ni fallor, una atque altera; apud Sohierium variae neque adeo nuper a puero efformata.”<sup>219</sup>

(“In the collection of our Prince is a painting of a man purported to be a Turkish potentate with a Dutchman’s head; Brouart has a portrait whose face is old and wrinkled like that of a philosopher. De Gheyn, I believe, has some portraits of youths, and Sohier diverse portraits which the artist painted some time ago, while still a pupil.”)<sup>220</sup>

In one sentence Huygens discusses *tronies* in the collections of the Stadhouder and court officials using the words *tronie* (effigies), head (*caput*) and face (*facies*), while in the title of the April 5, 1632 epigram, *In Effigiem meam, manu I. Livij*, he also calls Lievens’s portrait of him an *effigies*.<sup>221</sup>

Especially in making *tronies* of elderly models, Lievens took on the ambitious and difficult task of dignifying anti-ideal types such as the haggardly aged or exotic as the subjects of paintings, using light and pose to convey human dignity without embellishment or idealization. These genre heads appealed to princely collectors such as

---

<sup>219</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291.

<sup>220</sup> Roelof van Straten, *Rembrandt’s Leidse Tijd*. Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

<sup>221</sup> Huygens, in Schneider, 291. Leerintveld, 176.

Charles I and Frederik Hendrik, as well as to those private collectors mentioned by Huygens such as Nicolaas Sohier, Thomas Brouart and Jacques de Gheyn (a court artist), who may also have wanted virtuoso examples of Lievens's artistic specialty.<sup>222</sup> X-radiography has exposed instances in which Lievens overpainted his *tronies* of old men, additionally revealing that the process of making and refining them had a somewhat experimental character.<sup>223</sup> As Lyckle de Vries has explained, some of Lievens's self-portraits, which could technically not be considered *tronies*, were experimental studies of light and dark, expression, expressiveness, mood, or emotion and therefore functioned like *tronies*.<sup>224</sup>

### **The origins and style of Lievens's *tronies***

Lievens's earliest genre figures are closely related to paintings by Gerrit van Honthorst (1592-1656) and Hendrick ter Brugghen, who had both just returned from Rome to Utrecht in the mid 1610s under the spell of Caravaggio. These two artists reached the apex of their success in the mid 1620s and among their many works were a range of colorful images of musicians and soldiers. In *Old Woman reading* (Sum. 1214,

---

<sup>222</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

<sup>223</sup> Examples of *tronies* of old men overpainted by Lievens and recently discovered by x-ray occur in *Raising of Lazarus* (Sum. 1193, 1631, Brighton, fig. 66) and *Bust of an Old Woman* (Sum. 2360, c. 1631, Windsor Castle, fig. 40). The image visible in the x-ray of Rembrandt's *Bust of a man in a Gorget* (RRP I A8, c. 1626, Private Collection) may also be a *tronie* of an old man by Lievens. *Tronies* could be derived from a variety of creative processes as the recent restoration of a Rembrandt workshop *tronie* revealed. This work was painted over a Rembrandt self-portrait. Ernst van de Wetering, *Rembrandt's Hidden Self-portraits*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Museum het Rembrandthuis, 2003), 17-24.

<sup>224</sup> De Vries, 191, 194.

Philadelphia, fig. 6) of c.1621-23, Lievens employed the dramatic light and large, half-length figure that reflect the influence of these artists. Similarly, the model in Lievens's *Young man tuning a violin* (c. 1625, Leiden, fig. 36) of a few years later wears the kind of archaic slashed-sleeve costume that appears, for instance, in Ter Brugghen's *Fife Player* (1621, Kassel, fig. 37) and *Singing Lute Player* (c. 1624, London).<sup>225</sup> Lievens's two versions of a *Boy lighting a Torch* (Sum. 1216, c. 1625, Kassel, fig. 42, and Sum. 1225, c. 1625, Warsaw, fig. 44) are night scenes that closely reflect Honthorst's *Young man blowing on Coals* (c. 1620, Brussels). Lievens's interest in the works of the Caravaggisti is consistent with Lievens's acquisitive artistic personality and his love of boldness.<sup>226</sup> Although lacking the true anonymity and character of study heads, Caravaggist genre figures such as *Old Woman singing Street Songs* (c. 1620, Haarlem) by Honthorst, must have formed the basis for the development of Lievens's *tronies*.

In the works of both Rembrandt and Lievens, a type of *tronie* gradually emerged that was, with a few exceptions, neither a study for a history painting nor a studio model. Rather, their *tronies* formed groups or series of studies of the same model in different poses, light and costume, with little or no repetition. Each appears to have been done as an independent work of art to investigate psychological or expressive possibilities.

Lievens used a narrower range of facial expressions in *tronies* than Rembrandt and

---

<sup>225</sup> This newly discovered work was not cataloged by Schneider or Sumowski, and was acquired by the Lakenhal Museum in 1996. *Rembrandt: A Genius and His Impact*, Albert Blankert, ed., exh. cat. (Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria, 1997), 214-215. *Masters of Light*, 254-259. These paintings cannot properly be called *tronies* as they involve narrative and objects as identifying attributes, and belong to an existing Carravaggesque tradition of single-figured genre works that were intended to be finished works of art.

<sup>226</sup> Gary Schwartz has surmised that Rembrandt and Lievens could have been alerted to the work of Utrecht painters by their future patron Johannes Wttenbogaert who in 1626 registered at the Leiden Academy where Rembrandt and Lievens's siblings had studied, and who stayed with Hendrick Zwardecroon, related by marriage to Rembrandt, although Lievens's awareness of their work predates this by several years. Schwartz, 49-50.

avored works with a grave solemnity, for example in *Bust of an Old Woman* (Sum. 2360, c. 1631, Windsor Castle, fig. 40).<sup>227</sup> Lievens used a profile pose in at least seventeen of the nearly fifty *tronies* currently catalogued and in all seven of the etchings that he published as the *Diverse tronikens* (Holl. 33-41, c. 1630-32, see fig. 38). Lievens's *tronies* were successful with collectors, as they gave them sense of contact with the artistic process and the artist's studio.

### **Lievens's genre and Still Life Paintings of the Leiden period**

Although he trained with Lastman, a history painter, Lievens's earliest works were genre paintings. As a student he had copied genre works by Buytewech, and as an independent master he adapted the advanced and fashionable style of Utrecht and Haarlem to what he had learned and seen with Lastman in Amsterdam. The boldness of his scale and technique is especially evident in these works, and over time Lievens adapted to the interest in Leiden for paintings on the themes of study and vanitas.

#### ***The Five Senses***

*The Five Senses* (Sum.1179, c. 1623, formerly Chicago, fig. 9), one of Lievens's earliest surviving works, is not a history painting but a genre subject.<sup>228</sup> The strong

---

<sup>227</sup> Traditionally attributed to Rembrandt as recently as in the first volume of the Rembrandt Research Corpus, the attribution was shifted to Lievens in the second volume. Simon Levie, et al, *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings* I, II (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982), I 315-21 (A 32), II 839-40.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. Jan van Bijlert's *The Five Senses* (c. 1625-35, Wellesley, MA), a much more didactic work, with each person experiencing a separate one of the senses. *Sinners and Saints, Darkness and Light*. Dennis Weller, ed., exh. cat. (Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Museum of Art, 1998), 205.

lighting and genre subject call to mind the directness, ease, and crowding of the *The Merry Company* (1616/17, Rotterdam) by Willem Buytewech (whose prints Lievens studied and copied). Many of the same qualities mark an early work of Frans Hals, *Mardi Gras Revelers* of c. 1616 (New York, fig. 41).<sup>229</sup> In *The Five Senses* Lievens furthermore assimilates the color, mood and frieze-like composition and variety of gesture seen in such early religious works by de Grebber as the *Denial of Peter* (c. 1625, location unknown).<sup>230</sup> He merges these models to the large scale and half-length figures of works from Utrecht, for example Van Honthorst's *Merry Company (The Prodigal Son)* (1622, Munich).

### **Allegory of Fire**

Lievens's two paintings of a *Boy lighting a Torch* (Sum. 1216, c. 1625, Kassel, fig. 42, and Sum. 1225, c. 1625, Warsaw, fig. 44) harken back to Pliny the Elder's description of paintings by Lycius ("a boy blowing a dying fire") and Antiphilus ("Boy blowing a fire...and the light thrown on the boy's face").<sup>231</sup> Lievens, as Białostocki has argued, may have consciously sought to connect his work with this antique tradition by

---

<sup>229</sup> Boymans van Beuningen Museum inv. 1103. *Senses and Sins*, Jeroen Giltaij, ed., exh. cat. (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans van Beuningen, 2004), 43, 48.

<sup>230</sup> Pieter de Grebber, *Denial of St. Peter*, Philips London, December 5, 1989, lot 101. Compare to *Belshazzar's Feast* (1625, Kassel) and Gerrit van Honthorst, *Denial of Peter* (1620-25, Minneapolis).

<sup>231</sup> Like El Greco's canvas of the same subject (c. 1570-75, Naples), these likely illustrate the description of a painting by Antiphilus. Pliny, *Natural Histories* 35, 138. Jan Białostocki, "Puer sufflans ignes," *Arte in Europa. Scritti di Storia dell'Arte in onore di Edoardo Arslan*, I (Pavia, 1966), 593. Schwartz, 80. As illustrations of a classical *topos*, they cannot be seen as *tronies* although the coarsely brushed backgrounds give them the unfinished appearance of a study. *Masters of Light*, 239.

signing these paintings in Latin.<sup>232</sup> Sixteenth and seventeenth-century artists, from El Greco to Rubens, were fascinated by the subject, but none more than Honthorst, whose works may well have inspired Lievens to paint *Allegory of Fire and Childhood* (Sum. 1216, c. 1625, Kassel, fig. 42).<sup>233</sup>

An example of this subject by Lievens in Kassel represents *Fire* in a series of *The Four Elements*.<sup>234</sup> In two other examples in Warsaw, which are possibly pendants, a boy lights a torch using a glowing coal held in tongs (Sum 1225, c. 1625, Warsaw, fig. 44) and a boy with a pipe blows coals in a brazier (Sum. 1226, c. 1625, Warsaw, fig. 45). Rüdiger Klessmann speculated that because of their identical size and provenance, the two Warsaw panels must be part of a series of the five senses, representing “sight” and “smell” and the two are clearly differentiated by the senses invoked.<sup>235</sup> It would not be unusual to add layers of meanings to the classical motif since Lievens’s *Boy lighting a Torch* (Kassel) also symbolizes the element of fire. Honthorst, for examples, used the motif of a girl blowing a glowing coal to light a candle in *Soldier and a Girl* (c. 1622, Braunschweig, fig. 46) to symbolize rising passion.<sup>236</sup>

---

<sup>232</sup> Jan Lievens, *ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 48. Strictly speaking, by following such an *ekphrasis*, Lievens’s composition would not be a *tronie*. Białostocki, “Puer sufflans ignes,” 591-595.

<sup>233</sup> Białostocki, “Puer sufflans ignes,” 591-595.

<sup>234</sup> Białostocki, “Puer sufflans ignes,” 591-595.

<sup>235</sup> Jan Lievens, *ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 48, 50.

<sup>236</sup> Jan Lievens, *ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 242. Hermann Braun, *Gerard und Willem van Honthorst* (Ph. D. diss. Georg-August Universität, Göttingen, 1966), 150.

## Vanitas

The prevalence of *vanitas* still-lives in Leiden is reflected in a number of Lievens's genre paintings.<sup>237</sup> A *Homo Bulla* now in a private collection in Düsseldorf depicts a boy blowing bubbles out of a seashell using a clay pipe (Sum 1215, c. 1625, fig. 47). A later *Homo Bulla* (Sum 1227, c. 1628, Besançon, fig. 48) shows a boy blowing bubbles, again using a shell and pipe, but seated on a rock in a landscape. Around him are such traditional symbols of death and transience as an hourglass and bones. In the foreground Lievens lugubriously painted his monogram as if carved into a human femur.

Bubbles were already a *vanitas* motif in antiquity, a metaphor for the transience of life used by Lucian in his *Charon* and Varro in his *De Re Rustica* (c. 36 B.C.).<sup>238</sup> In the Renaissance, Erasmus included "Homo bulla" in the *Adagia*, a collection of proverbs published in 1500.<sup>239</sup> The image of a putto blowing bubbles has uncertain origins, but it suggested the notion of fleeting youth.<sup>240</sup> The motif was popularized in the Netherlands

---

<sup>237</sup> *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1626*, 79-81.

<sup>238</sup> "Let me tell you, Hermes, what I think men and the whole life of man resemble. You have noticed bubbles in water; caused by a streamlet splashing down- I mean those that mass to make foam? Some of them, being small, burst and are gone in an instant, while some last longer and as others join they become swollen and grow to exceeding great compass; but afterwards they also burst without fail in time, for it cannot be otherwise. Such is the life of men; they are all swollen with wind, some to greater size, others to less; and with some the swelling is short-lived and swift-fated, while with others it is over as soon as it comes into being; but in any case they all must burst." *Lucian, with an English translation* II, A.M. Harmon, trans. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), 435. Mordechai Omer "Turner's Biblical Deluge and the iconography of 'homo bulla'," *Comparative Criticism Volume 5, Hermeneutic Criticism*, E.S. Shaffer, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 134. "Man is a bubble... I am in my eightieth year, which warns me to pack up my baggage in readiness to journey out of this world." Marcus Terrentius Varro, *De Re Rustica*, Wolfgang Stechow, trans., in Stechow, 227.

<sup>239</sup> Erasmus, *Adagiorum Chiliades sive Adagia* II/III, (Leiden, 1708), Nr. 4. Wolfgang Stechow, "Homo Bulla," *Art Bulletin* 20 (1938): 227, note 7.

<sup>240</sup> Horst W. Janson, "The Putto with the Death's Head," *Art Bulletin* 19 (1937): 428-429.



through a 1594 print by Hendrick Goltzius entitled “Quis Evadet” (“who escapes”).<sup>241</sup>

The presence of bones in Lievens’s Besançon painting indicates that Goltzius’s print was his source of inspiration.<sup>242</sup>

The theme “Homo Bulla” was consistent with the taste for *vanitas* still lifes in Leiden, such as those by David Bailly (c. 1625, St. Gilgen, Switzerland),<sup>243</sup> Jan Davidsz de Heem (1629, Liberec) and two by Lievens himself (Sum. 1299, c. 1627, Heino, fig. 50 and Sum. 1300, c. 1627, Amsterdam, fig. 51).<sup>244</sup> In the Heino panel, symbols of death and the brevity of life such as the candle, hourglass and skull, are placed beside books, musical instruments and sheet music. Books symbolized vanity since they embodied wisdom passing with its bearer, music, because it fades. The lute, books and globe in the Amsterdam panel symbolize not only wisdom and pleasure, but also vanity. The jug, glass, and plate with a bread roll were added to the composition (no reserves were left for them), probably by the still life painter Jan Davidsz de Heem, whose painting style was very close to that of Lievens.<sup>245</sup> Lievens’s monochromatic *vanitas* still lifes show how

---

<sup>241</sup> Joos van Cleve (lost painting) and Jerome Bosch, in *Garden of Earthly Delights* (c. 1515, Madrid) pictured the world in a glass or bubble-like sphere and Cornelis Ketel made paintings of the same subject prior to Goltzius. Ketel’s image, entitled “ΠΟΜΦΟΛΥΕ Ο ΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΟΣ” (“man is a bubble”) (1574, Switzerland) perhaps followed a composition by Metsys, who painted a *vanitas* motif on the reverse of a portrait. Stechow, 227-228. Brigitte Lymant, “Sic Transit Gloria Mundi. Ein Glasgemälde mit Seifenblasen als Vanitassymbol im Schnütgen-Museum,” *Wallraff-Richartz Jahrbuch* XCII (1981): 121.

<sup>242</sup> The bones do not occur in the emblem “Homo Bulla” in the anonymous *Nieuwen Ieuchtspiegel* (Amsterdam, 1617).

<sup>243</sup> *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1626*, 83. Cf. Bailly’s “Quis Evadet” with a pipe, skull and hourglass drawn in the *Album Amicorum of Cornelis de Montigny de Glarges* (1624, The Hague).

<sup>244</sup> *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1626*, 80. Christopher Brown rejected the attributions of both still lifes to Lievens, but the connections in style to the still life details in works like the Bamberg *Evangelists* (Sum. 1230-33, c. 1626/7, fig. 53) are unmistakable. Fred Meijer also asserts that the Heino painting is inconsistent with Lievens’s style of 1627 although he cites no comparison example. [www.rkd.nl](http://www.rkd.nl) (Accessed November 30, 2005). Christopher Brown, rev. Jan Lievens, *ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*. Rüdiger Klessmann, ed., *Burlington Magazine* 121 (1980): 742.

<sup>245</sup> This panel was recycled, the current still life covers a three-quarter-length portrait of a young woman c.

he adapted to the local demand for still life and collaborated with De Heem, its major practitioner. Lievens also developed his abilities in still life because he was aware of its potential to enrich the detail and realism of history paintings.

### ***Boy studying Drawings***

*Boy studying Drawings* (Sch. 129, c. 1628, Paris, fig. 52), a genre composition that recalls Orlers's story of Lievens himself studying Buytewech prints in 1618, and may well reflect the nature of Lievens's own training with Lastman, is one of Lievens's few works on artistic pedagogy. The shaggy-haired boy studies books of drawings on his lap as he sits before a cast or copy of the Christ child excerpted from Michelangelo's renowned *Bruges Madonna*. In his 1603-4 *Schilder-Boeck*, the Haarlem artist and author Karel van Mander emphasized to students that "rapen" (borrowing) made for good paintings.<sup>246</sup>

It is unclear who was the model for the boy, but Schneider recognized that the

---

1620-30. Bob Haak, *Rembrandt, zijn leven, zijn werk, zijn tijd*, (New York: Abrams, 1969), 68-69. The style in which the bread roll in the front is painted is distinctly different from the one in Lievens's *Feast of Esther* and has been attributed to Jan Jansz den Uyl (1595/5-1639/40) of Amsterdam by Bob Haak. The style is close to the hard, monochromatic character of Uyl (cf. *Still Life with Tazza, Tin Saucer and roll*, c. 1635, Maastricht), but there are no dated examples by Uyl for direct comparison. As a follower of den Uyl, De Heem's early style is quite similar and as a resident of Leiden, he would be a more logical candidate for artist of this section of the painting and as a collaborator of Lievens. It is not clear the collaboration was intended by Lievens. Arie Wallaert, *Really Rembrandt?* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2006), 1. The 1640 inventory of Jan Jansz Orlers's collection shows that Orlers, Lievens's biographer and early neighbor, owned two "breakfast" still lifes by Lievens of the type associated with the Haarlem school. Haak, *Rembrandt, zijn leven, zijn werk, zijn tijd*, 68. *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1626*, 79-80.

<sup>246</sup> The painting recalls Orlers's anecdote about Lievens copying Buytewech prints. Van Mander, *Grondt I*, 99-107.

drawing being studied depicted the model commonly known as “Rembrandt’s Father.”<sup>247</sup> Schnackenburg suggests that the plaster model was possibly the piece mentioned in Rembrandt’s inventory of 1657 as “Een kindeken van MichaelAngelo Bonalotti.”<sup>248</sup> Lievens seems to have used this cast previously, as model for the angel in the Bamberg *St. Matthew* (Sum.1230, c. 1626 –7, fig. 53). Schnackenburg also notes that the longhaired angel in *St. Matthew* resembles the *Boy studying Drawings*.<sup>249</sup>

Prior to 1932, when Hans Schneider included *Boy studying Drawings* in his catalogue of Lievens’s paintings, this work had been mistakenly attributed to the Dutch painter Wallerand Vaillant (1623-1677).<sup>250</sup> This confusion stemmed from the mezzotint copy Vaillant had made after Lievens’s composition and the subsequent variants that Vaillant painted after Lievens’s composition (see examples in Lille and London).<sup>251</sup> In 2000, Jacques Foucart bolstered the argument for the attribution of the Louvre painting to Lievens by noting that the boy’s costume dated to c. 1630.<sup>252</sup> Lievens’s inspiration may

---

<sup>247</sup> Schneider, 123. It is equally unclear to whom the sculptures and drawings depicted by Lievens belonged. Lievens is not recorded as having students at the moment the Louvre painting was created, around 1629-30, and none of Lievens’s siblings seems a likely candidate. The youngest brother Titus was 14 by 1630. Lievens and Rembrandt often shared models, but Rembrandt’s pupil Gerrit Dou was 17 years old and Isaack Joudreville was already an adult in the *Self-portrait* of 1629 (1629, Dublin). *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 59-61.

<sup>248</sup> Schnackenburg, “Knabe im Atelier,” 35.

<sup>249</sup> Schnackenburg, “Knabe im Atelier,” 34, 35.

<sup>250</sup> Lievens’s painting was listed in the inventory of Margaretha Gallié de Brais, The Hague, 1677 as “een schildery door Jan Lievens, synde een teyckenaertje”. It was exhibited in London in 1878 as by Vaillant, however, and sold at Christies London, May 14, 1926, still as by Vaillant. A. Bredius, *Künstler-Inventäre* I, 217. Schneider, 123.

<sup>251</sup> Schneider, 123. W. Sumowski and Seymour Slive also accept the attribution to Lievens. Jacques Foucart, “Le tableau du mois no. 42: Le Jeune Dessinateur de Jan Lievens et non de Wallerand Vaillant.” *Le Tableau du mois no. 1 à 50-1993-1998*, (Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2000), 180.

<sup>252</sup> Marie-Joseph Bossan of the Musée International de la Chaussure in Romans, to Jacques Foucart, 1997, dates the boy’s shoes to c. 1630. (letter in object file, Centre de Documentation du Louvre). Foucart, 180.

have been Guido Reni's *Painting and Drawing*, which depicted a boy drawing and which was in the collection of Lievens's patron Nicolaes Sohier by 1626.<sup>253</sup> Lievens's charming composition, and the manner by which the boy closely studies art, expresses a theoretical concern important to Lievens, that the careful synthesis of contemporary and past masters was more important than slavishly imitating one's own teacher.

This painting partly illustrates Huygens's observation that Lievens disdained working from nature. The young artist is building a stock of mental imagery from other art, including that of Michelangelo, in his imagination, imagery that he will creatively employ and transform in his work, as Lievens did in the case of Bamberg *St. Matthew*. Although Lievens himself did copy masterpieces as a youth, in this painting he emphasizes the importance of studying and learning the work of other masters.

*Boy studying Drawings* is an unique but significant instance in Lievens's early oeuvre in which the subject of art was the process of artistic education itself. Since Lievens had no pupils in Leiden to spread his stylistic and thematic approach, little is known about his attitudes toward artistic education beyond those expressed in this painting.<sup>254</sup> Lievens's c. 1627 *Quill-cutter* (Sum. 1235, formerly Kreuzlingen, fig. 54), however, appears to complement the Louvre painting's theme of pedagogy.<sup>255</sup> This

---

<sup>253</sup> Meijer, "Italian Paintings in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Holland," 380.

<sup>254</sup> Jan Steen (a friend of Lievens) shows a woodcut *tronie* by Lievens (Holl. 106) being used to teach drawing in one of his paintings. It was included on the table in front of students in *The Drawing Lesson* of c.1663-1665 (Los Angeles). *Jan Steen, Painter and Storyteller*, Guido Jansen, ed., exh. cat. (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1996), 186. Many thanks to Berndt Ebert for pointing out works by Lievens and Rembrandt that, in turn, appear in the still lifes of Isaak Luttichuys, albeit in the context of the theme of vanitas rather than pedagogy.

<sup>255</sup> The quill-cutter may present an allegory of "practice" following J. A. Emmens's reading of Gerrit Dou's lost *Braamcamp triptych*. J. A. Emmens, "A Seventeenth-century theory of Art," *Looking at Seventeenth-century Dutch Art*, Wayne Franits, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 17-19. *Boy studying Drawings* is the same height (127 cm) and at 99 cm. wide, only 6 cm narrower than *The Quill-cutter*.

painting shows a merchant sharpening his quill, surrounded by ledgers, purses, and papers filed on strings, objects that allude to the importance of learning through practice. Since it has nearly the same size as the Louvre canvas (they differ only in width by 8.5 cm.), and very similar composition of interior space and level of still-life detail, it is possible that the two formed a pendant pair of allegories of learning and practice.

In a university city like Leiden, the theme of study had broad appeal and the subject is frequently found in paintings by Leiden artists, as in Jan Davidsz de Heem's *Student in his Room* (1628, Oxford) and Rembrandt's *Old Man sleeping beside a Fire* (Bredius 428, 1629, Turin).<sup>256</sup> Lievens's now-lost *Student by a Turf Fire* (Sch. 116, c. 1628) also belongs to this tradition.

Lievens's proficiency in genre and still life aided his practice of history painting, the most important branch of painting in the seventeenth century, but also allowed him to innovate in art. Through his synthesis of Lastman's and Rubens's style with the subject matter drawn from the work of painters from Haarlem, Utrecht, and Leiden, Lievens invested his dramatic history paintings of the mid-to-late 1620s with realism and dignity that convey the grandeur and seriousness of the subjects he portrayed.

### **History Painting**

In Leiden, Lievens developed as a history painter by adapting and absorbing the leading styles from Utrecht, Amsterdam, and Haarlem as well as Flanders, and by

---

<sup>256</sup> Schwartz, 95. *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1627*, 9.

audaciously approaching potential clients such as Constantijn Huygens. The patronage for history painting in Holland was largely private, and Lievens went to great lengths, hitherto not fully studied, to succeed and build a clientele for his work. Lievens's early religious beliefs are not documented but his family's history and affiliation and the protection of the Counter-Remonstrant Orlers indicate that while in Leiden he identified with the Calvinist Counter-Remonstrants.

When Lievens moved to Protestant England in 1632, he came under the sway of Anthony van Dyck, a Catholic, but he probably remained a Protestant. However, after he moved to Antwerp in 1635, his religious persuasion changed. By 1638 he had openly converted to Catholicism when he married in the Catholic St. Jacob's church in Antwerp and later baptized his son Jan Andrea there. Upon his return to Holland in 1644 and even through his second marriage, he seems to have remained Catholic.

As Volker Manuth has demonstrated, however, artists in seventeenth-century Holland neither restricted themselves to the clients nor the subject matter of their own religious persuasion; indeed, Lievens's patrons for religious paintings during his Leiden period included both Catholics, such as Jan van der Graft, for whom he painted *Pilate washing his Hands* (Sum. 1180, c. 1625, Leiden, fig. 13) and an *Ecce Homo* (Sch. 34, lost), as well as Counter-Remonstrant Calvinists like Orlers who acquired a series of the *Four Evangelists* (Sum. 1230-3, c. 1626, Bamberg, fig. 53).<sup>257</sup> Manuth found that in general the nature of the religious imagery used by artists in Rembrandt's circle, and especially religious images using novel iconography, tended to be determined more by a client's demands than by an artist's own convictions. Lievens may have ambitiously

---

<sup>257</sup> Volker Manuth, "Denomination and Iconography: the choice of subject matter in the biblical painting of the Rembrandt circle," *Simiolus* 22 (1993/4): 236-238. Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

taken the initiative in a few instances, especially, for example, in his 1630 print of the *Raising of Lazarus* (Holl. 7, 1630) and the subsequent painting based on its design (Sum. 1193, Brighton, fig. 66). As will be demonstrated below, these works respond to religious discussions current at the time by expositing specific Calvinist doctrines with great incisiveness.

### ***Feast of Esther***

The psychological intensity and unity that Lievens created through his pictorial organization and effects of light and dark in *Feast of Esther* (Sum. 1181, c. 1625, Raleigh, fig. 14) is more mature than in *The Five Senses* (Sum. 1179, c. 1623, formerly Chicago, fig. 9) and *Backgammon Players* (Sum. 1178, c. 1623, Cape Town, fig. 11).<sup>258</sup> In *Feast of Esther*, Lievens created a powerful sense of tension at this moment of reversal of fate as Esther pleads for her people at the banquet for King Ahasuerus and his favorite, the prince Haman:

“If I have found favor in your sight, O king, and if it pleases the king, let my life be given me as my petition, and my people as my request; for we have been sold, I and my people, to be destroyed, to be killed and to be annihilated. Now if we had only been sold as slaves, men and women, I would have remained silent, for the trouble would not be

---

<sup>258</sup> Klessmann proposed that a Lastmanesque painting, *Presentation in the Temple* (Amsterdam), was by Lievens of c. 1621, which would have made it his first history painting. This attribution met with serious objections at the time. *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 40-43. Christopher Brown objected to the inclusion of the painting in Lievens’s oeuvre because of its uncertain attribution. Sumowski mentioned that since the man holding the candle was added to the fifth state of Rembrandt’s print *Raising of Lazarus* (Bartsch 73, 1631) and for other Rembrandt-like qualities, it had to be attributed to his shop c. 1631. Brown, rev. of *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 741. Sumowski, rev. *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 11.

commensurate with the annoyance to the king.”  
(Esther 7:3,4)

Ahashuerus favored Esther, chosen from the Jewish exiles, exceptionally among his wives (Esther 2: 13, 5:2), and his anger erupted at Haman when she exposed him as the plotter against her people: “A foe and an enemy is this wicked Haman!” (Esther 7:6). In Lievens’s work the contained rage of King Ahashuerus collides with the cowering Haman.<sup>259</sup> Lievens emphasized the sinister nature of Haman by placing him in darkness and through this means, as well, the foreboding of his death on the very gallows he had prepared for Esther’s uncle Mordechai (Esther 7: 9, 10).<sup>260</sup>

In the story of Esther, the plotter Haman suffers a dramatic reversal of fate and is justly executed. Lievens’s probable family affiliation was with the Counter-Remonstrant cause and his career was promoted by the Counter-Remonstrant patrician Orlers. Orlers devoted a lengthy section of the 1619 revision of his 1610 panegyric to the House of Orange, *Waerachtige beschryvinge en afbeeldinghe van alle de overwinninghen*, to the struggles of 1618 and triumph of the Counter-Remonstrant cause through the agency of

---

<sup>259</sup> Lievens’s drawing of *Mucius Scaevola and Porsenna* (Sum. 1623x, c. 1625, Leiden) has many parallels to the painting *Feast of Esther*, principally the gesture of Porsenna holding his hand to the fire, which is repeated in the painting as the clenched fist of Ahasuerus and ultimately drawn from Rubens’s painting of *Mucius Scaevola and Porsenna* (c. 1626-8, Budapest). They also share the use of silhouetted foreground figures that are detached from the narrative but used as repoussoirs, a device that frequently appears in works by Pynas and Lastman.

<sup>260</sup> Faint lines in black chalk in Lievens’s drawing *Esther and Ahashuerus* (Sum. D1630, c. 1623, Dresden), which dates to nearly the same period as *Mucius Scaevola and Porsenna*, show that Lievens moved the figure of Esther closer to Ahashuerus, grouping them against Haman. In this composition, Lievens did not yet apply the Caravaggesque half-length figure scale nor achieve the psychological intensity of contrasting light and gesture and dramatic emotions (wrath and fear) of the painting. Instead we still find the broad lighting and conventional figure scale and typical gestures associated with Lastman, especially the modest shame of Haman. While Sumowski and others date the drawing to 1628, its use as a preparatory drawing most likely connected to the painting suggest an earlier date of c. 1625. Sumowski bases his dates for the Leiden drawing and the one in Dresden on what he perceives to be the dependence of the Leiden drawing on Rembrandt’s *David presents the Head of Goliath to Saul* (Bredius 488, 1627, Basel), but the drawing seems to belong to Lievens’s earlier style. Pieter de Grebber used the composition in his *John the Baptist before Herod* (c. 1625-30, Lille).



Prince Maurits of Orange. This opens the possibility that Lievens's c. 1623 *Feast of Esther* may be a political allegory of the trial and execution of the States pensionary and Remonstrant Johan van Oldenbarnevelt for treason in 1619, at the instigation of Stadhouder Prince Maurits. The Counter-Remonstrants viewed Maurits (Ahasuerus) as their protector who liberated them from the threat of state-imposed Remonstrant orthodoxy. Oldenbarnevelt's trial and beheading were, like Haman's condemnation and hanging, a dramatic and swift reversal of fate.<sup>261</sup> If, as Gary Schwartz argues, the Leiden Remonstrant Petrus Scriverius commissioned Rembrandt's *Stoning of Stephen* (Bredius 531a, 1625, Lyon), and if Rembrandt's painting is indeed an allegory arguing that the execution was a martyrdom, it is reasonable to assume that the same underlying motivation is possible in the case of Lievens's earlier picture. The large size of the painting also suggests that it was commissioned, although its original patron is unknown.<sup>262</sup>

### ***Samson and Delilah***

---

<sup>261</sup> In an effort to unify the Reformed church and quell civil unrest, the States of Holland under Oldenbarnevelt had adopted a policy of repressing the division in the Reformed church and quelling the resulting unrest by the "Sharp Resolution" adopted August 4, 1617, through which troops called *waardgelders* were stationed in the towns, effectively suppressing the Calvinist Counter-Remonstrant preachers and protecting the Remonstrant congregations who were the followers of the Leiden theologian Arminius. This policy and resolution was opposed not only by the Counter-Remonstrant towns, but by the Stadhouder Maurits, who saw it as an abrogation of his authority. The Synod of Dordrecht of 1618 decisively resolved the theological conflict against the Remonstrants, and was followed by a "coup d'etat" against the States by Prince Maurits that led to the trial for treason of Oldenbarnevelt and the unexpected death sentence that was quickly carried out on May 13, 1619. Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic. Its rise, its greatness and fall 1477-1806* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1995), 441-449, 459. Schwartz, 36-38.

<sup>262</sup> Sumowski, *Gemälde III*, 1776.

Lievens made two different paintings of the betrayal of Samson, the first a small grisaille of 1627/8 (27.5 x 23.7 cm, Sum. 1184, Amsterdam, fig. 55) with full-length figures and a second larger panel (Sum. 1185, Amsterdam, fig. 56) with half-length figures. Rubens painted his large *Samson and Delilah* for Nicolas Rockox around 1610 (London, fig. 57) and in 1613 a Haarlem printmaker, Jacob Matham (1571-1631), published an engraving of it (fig. 58).<sup>263</sup> Lievens's smaller grisaille (fig. 55) panel roughly follows the composition of this print after Rubens, which reverses the composition of Rubens's painting. Certain details, such as the profile view of Delilah, the soldiers waiting in a doorway in the background, and Samson slumped on Delilah's lap with his limp arm hanging down and hand curled, are all found in the print.<sup>264</sup> The composition of the later version with half-length figures is similar, but Delilah hands the scissors to the oncoming soldier, who throws up his hands in fear.

The two versions are examples of Lievens's ability to paint the same subject in different formats and styles. It is unclear what purpose the uncharacteristically small grisaille with its full-length figures served. One possibility is that it was a preliminary study for a print, like *St. Jerome Penitent* (Holl. 15, c. 1630/31, fig. 70, and Sum. 1242, c. 1630/1, Leiden, fig. 69), but more likely it served as preparatory sketch for the larger

---

<sup>263</sup> Schwartz posits that Christiaan van Cowenbergh's 1632 *Samson and Delilah* was commissioned by the Dordrecht Town Council and installed in a meeting room as a warning to the council not to be seduced by Spain into making peace. Schwartz, 83. This raises the possibility that Lievens's painting may have been commissioned to serve a similar function, but sadly its original location is unknown. Madlyn Millner Kahr posited that Lievens borrowed the position of the limp arm in his larger painting from Guercino's 1619 painting *Samson and Delilah* (Bologna) made for Cardinal Serra, although without explaining how Lievens could have derived such a minor detail, essentially Samson resting his head on his own arm, from Guercino. Kahr also attributed Lievens's use of the half-length figures to Guercino's influence. Nearly all other details potentially derived from Guercino's composition already occur in Matham's earlier print after Rubens. It seems more likely that he invented the detail himself. Madlyn Millner Kahr, "Rembrandt and Delilah," *Art Bulletin* 55 (1972): 240, 241.

<sup>264</sup> Kahr, "Rembrandt and Delilah," 254. Schwartz, 83.

scale depiction of Samson and Delilah, as its composition is, in fact, rather closely connected to it.<sup>265</sup> Such a shift in figure scale and narrative occurs, for example, between the Dresden preparatory drawing for *The Feast of Esther* and the painting in Raleigh (both c. 1623). In the large panel of *Samson and Delilah*, the agitated and tilted pose of the soldier, the half-length figures and evenly lit foreground suggest a date around 1628.

The two paintings of *Samson and Delilah* demonstrate Lievens's awareness of the achievement of Rubens. Instead of focusing on the drama of betrayal of love, as Rubens did, Lievens emphasized the tension between Delilah's determination and the fear the Philistines express. In the larger work Lievens also moved the action to the foreground. The evenly balanced light falling upon Samson's massive body projects a sense of calm that accentuates his obliviousness to the coming horror. Although Lievens was inspired by Rubens's composition, the mood he creates is a sharp contrast to the shrill confusion of Rubens's painting, in which the silhouettes of the stalking figures of the Philistine soldiers in the doorway emphasize the tension of the secret attack at night. By referring to Rubens's composition Lievens adheres to Quintillian's dictum to imitate only the best masters. The alterations Lievens makes recall Rubens's own free "copies" after sculpture, paintings and drawings, by which he sought to improve them.<sup>266</sup>

The lone Philistine soldier in Lievens's larger *Samson and Delilah* (fig. 56) recoils from Delilah who seems to thrust the scissor towards his hand.<sup>267</sup> Lievens thus

---

<sup>265</sup> Grisailles of indeterminate use occur in Rembrandt's work for decades, such as the *Entombment* of c. 1639 (Bredius 554, Glasgow) and the *Lamentation* on paper of c. 1643 (Bredius 565, London). Schwartz, 116, 117.

<sup>266</sup> Muller, 239-242.

<sup>267</sup> Madlyn Millner Kahr, "Delilah," *Art Bulletin* 54 (1972), in *Feminism and Art History, Questioning the*

makes Delilah an active accomplice to the capture rather than the reluctant victim of blackmail shown in Rubens's composition, where she lovingly fingers Samson's hair as it falls off. Lievens removes all doubt or regret from Delilah's active, deliberate betrayal, contrasting her fierce, determined expression to that of the timid soldier.

In Lievens's small grisaille (fig. 55) Samson rests his head face down on Delilah's knee and his eyes are covered, his inebriated state emphasized by the ewer and tipped cup on the platter. Delilah lifts a finger to her lips to caution the tiptoeing soldier, who approaches with scissors in hand, not to awaken the still powerful Samson. This smaller painting was probably a preparatory work or possibly even the "sketch" of Samson listed in Frederik Hendrik's inventory, rather than the one left in Lievens's own inventory after his death in 1674, which was not listed as a sketch.<sup>268</sup> Rembrandt seems to have based his c. 1629 painting (Bredius 489, Berlin) on Lievens's grisaille, adopting its vertical format, the limited number of figures and their basic placement. Rembrandt also drew from Lievens the motif of Delilah holding up Samson's hair. In engaging Rubens's much larger model, Lievens makes reference to the success Rubens's composition enjoyed in Antwerp, and exposes his determination to cultivate his own method and style in keeping with that of the most successful history painter of the day.

### ***Christ on the Cross***

---

*Litany*, eds. Norma Brouse and Mary D. Garrard (New York: Harper and Row, 1982), 128.

<sup>268</sup> Schwartz, 82.

In 1630 and 1631 Lievens and Rembrandt each produced paintings from two episodes in the life of Christ, *Christ on the Cross* (fig. 59) and the *Raising of Lazarus* (fig. 66). For Lievens, these complete the shift to a dark monochromatic style occurring around 1628 to 1629, exactly when he met Huygens. This shift is best summarized in his oeuvre by comparing the light and monumental c. 1628 “*Sultan Soliman*” (Sum. 1236, Potsdam, fig. 18), which Huygens mentions was in the Stadhouder’s collection, and dark *Capuchin Monk praying* (Sum, 1236, 1629, Monteviot, fig. 43), dated to the following year.

In his autobiography, Huygens described Rembrandt’s *Judas returning the Thirty Pieces of Silver* (Bredius 539a, 1629, Private Collection) as “...the equivalent of the best works of all Italy and the ancients.”<sup>269</sup> In some manner, Huygens managed to communicate his thoughts and preferences to Lievens and provoked a hostile reaction: “He either roundly rejects all criticism or, if he acknowledges its validity, takes it in a bad spirit.”<sup>270</sup> The history paintings Lievens produced after his first encounter with Huygens in 1628 indicate that he understood Huygens’s preference for the expression of passion and emotion in Rembrandt’s history paintings, and this indicated to Lievens the direction in which he was best advised to take his work.<sup>271</sup> From 1630 to 1631 Lievens and Rembrandt produced several religious paintings and prints on identical or similar themes that indicate a kind of competition to secure a commission from the Stadhouder for a

---

<sup>269</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 132 -133.

<sup>270</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

<sup>271</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

series of such works, for which Huygens eventually recommended Rembrandt.<sup>272</sup> The order in which compositions in this “competition” were produced remains uncertain.

In 1631 Lievens (Sum. 1245, c. 1631, Nancy, fig. 59) and Rembrandt (Bredius 543a, Mas d’Agenais, fig. 60) each produced their versions of *Christ on the Cross* in the same arched-top format. Each was an artistic response to Paulus Pontius’s 1631 large-scale engraving (fig. 61) after Rubens’s *Christ on the Cross* (lost) that Rubens had unsuccessfully offered to Sir Dudley Carleton in 1618.<sup>273</sup> Rubens’s painting too had an arched top and, at 60 cm in height, a monumentality of its own.<sup>274</sup> The two paintings could have been proposals or competition pieces for the proposed *Passion* series for Frederik Hendrik under the auspices of Huygens, but it is not clear how this competition occurred. In any case, they are inseparably linked to the *Passion* cycle that Rembrandt was awarded and eventually produced for the Stadhouder between 1631 and 1639.

Lievens and Rembrandt each chose different moments from the narrative. Rembrandt followed Rubens and showed Christ facing death, before his side was pierced.<sup>275</sup> Rembrandt’s Christ cries out as the angry victim abandoned by God who rages, “...why have you forsaken me?” Rembrandt furthermore omitted the halo that appears in Pontius’s print. Lievens, in contrast, chose a moment after Christ’s death,

---

<sup>272</sup> Rembrandt began delivering the first paintings in 1633. Schwartz, 106.

<sup>273</sup> Lievens seems to have taken this painting to Antwerp after 1635, as the first mention of a Lievens *Christ on the Cross* occurs in an inventory there in 1673. Sumowski, *Gemälde* III, 1797.

<sup>274</sup> Pontius may have based his print on the twelve-foot tall *Crucifixion* (lost) that Rubens unsuccessfully offered to Sir Dudley Carlton in 1618 for five hundred guilders, and which likely never went to Holland. Schwartz, 88.

<sup>275</sup> “...when they saw that He was already dead...one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear...” John 19:33, 34.

after "...he looked to heaven and said 'Father, into Your hands I commit my Spirit.' Having said this He breathed His last" (Luke 23: 46).

Lievens also isolated the figure of Christ, composing him as a smaller figure in a larger empty background than did either Rembrandt or Rubens.<sup>276</sup> As in *Samson and Delilah*, Lievens adapted Rubens's composition to his own original interpretation of the *Crucifixion*. Lievens emphasizes the pathos of dependency and resignation of Christ, his isolation and abandonment by God the Father. The dark, cloudy sky illustrates the moment of Christ's death when, "...darkness fell over the whole land, because the sun was obscured..." (Luke 23:44, 45). Lievens and Rembrandt omitted the landscape background and the flying angels in Rubens's composition and used a coarse, forbidding undressed tree-trunk as the upright support of the cross. Lievens's slightly off-center composition adds poignancy by making the void seem even greater. The bleak diagonal grid pattern of clouds seems cold and menacing when compared to Rembrandt's small, puffy clouds and the sympathetic, halo-like patch of illuminated sky behind Rembrandt's Christ.

Rembrandt illuminated the entire cross and accentuated its texture and substance, making the figure of Christ seem almost part of the cross. Lievens's cross, in contrast, is much darker and less organic or substantial. Instead of placing the post of the cross at the center of the composition, Lievens shifted it to the right and positioned the stream of blood from Christ's side directly on the central axis to emphasize its Eucharistic significance. The labels fixed to the cross in Rembrandt's painting and Pontius's

---

<sup>276</sup> Ernst van de Wetering, in *Geschildert tot Leyden anno 1627*, 25-26. Van de Wetering speculates that the *Crucifixion* is the long, arched painting on the easel in Rembrandt's drawing of an artist, which thus seems to show Lievens in his studio c. 1630. At 129 cm tall, this could very well be that painting.

engraving are vertical, and reinforce the form of Christ's body. Lievens's horizontal sheet, in contrast, emphasizes the crossbar supporting Christ's arms, accentuating his suspension and weightlessness.

Rembrandt's version of *Christ on the Cross* displays an angry Christ. Emotional expression was precisely the quality that Huygens admired so deeply in Rembrandt's *Judas* and was thus no doubt a factor in Rembrandt's eventual triumph over Lievens in securing the *Passion* cycle commission. Lievens's ambition in this "competition" may have been overreaching, as he rendered a *Christ on the Cross* who was too dark and severe, bloody and resigned to death, when what Huygens most admired and sought was the rendering of emotion and passion.

### ***Raising of Lazarus***

The resurrection of Lazarus (John 11) preceded the story of the passion of Christ proper and the images of the miracle that Lievens and Rembrandt made began with a c. 1630 print by Lievens (fig. 65), rather than a painting for Frederik Hendrik. The story of Christ's resurrection of Lazarus, brother of Mary and friend of Jesus, was one of the most popular subjects for artists in Amsterdam in the second and third decades of the seventeenth century, as popular as it had been earlier in Flanders.<sup>277</sup> Its appeal was many-layered; the death of Lazarus provoked Christ to tears (John 11: 35), the miracle of his resurrection was dramatic, the episode foreshadowed Christ's own death and

---

<sup>277</sup> Herwig Guratzsch, *Die Auferweckung des Lazarus im Niederländischen Kunst 1400-1800*. I (Kortrijk: Van Gemert, 1983), 95-121.



resurrection, and as an allegory of salvation it could be used to illustrate specific religious teachings about salvation. The paintings and etchings of this story produced by Rembrandt and Lievens from 1630-1632 also represent the most intense moment of the “competition” between them.

In his artist biographies, Karel van Mander discussed one of the earliest Netherlandish versions of *The Raising of Lazarus* by Aelbert van Ouwater of Haarlem (1450-51, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin).<sup>278</sup> In this composition, the bystanders are organized around Christ and Lazarus and broken into two groups, the Jews and the disciples, according to the typological method of interpreting the Bible that contrasted the Old and New Testaments. By the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, the iconography changed. Otto van Veen’s *Raising of Lazarus* (c. 1608, Ghent, fig. 62) and the composition by Peter Paul Rubens (1618, formerly Berlin, fig. 63) engraved by Boetius Bolswert, exemplify Lazarus as refashioned by the seventeenth-century Counter-Reformation in the Catholic Church, which reasserted the role of saints as intercessors on behalf of supplicants.<sup>279</sup>

In these works the act of the disciples and figures physically helping Lazarus out of the tomb and unwrapping him becomes more important than the typological dichotomy between Old and New Testaments evident in the earlier versions. In the foreground of Van Veen’s painting even Mary gestures to the viewers directly, as if acting as their saintly intermediary. Rubens’s composition is dominated by Mary and

---

<sup>278</sup> Karel van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck* (1604, Utrecht: Davaco, 1969), 205v.

<sup>279</sup> Guratzsch II, 353.

Peter actively helping Lazarus from the tomb and the dynamic figures of Christ and Lazarus striding towards each other.

The subject of Lazarus's resurrection was popular with Lievens's teacher Lastman and the circle of the so-called "Pre-Rembrandtists" in Amsterdam, the group of classicising history painters who had traveled to Rome and who were Catholic. In one version, Lastman (1622, The Hague, fig. 64) follows Catholic iconography. The disciples and Mary form a kind of chain of intermediaries between Christ and Lazarus, helping Lazarus out of the tomb and unwrapping him. This painting could even have been in preparation while Jan Lievens was still in Lastman's workshop.<sup>280</sup>

Lievens departed decisively from Lastman's formula in his etching of c. 1630 (Holl. 7, fig. 65). Enveloped by a star-shaped aureole, Christ stands by himself on a ledge directly above Lazarus, who is also alone. Christ's eyes are closed and his head is tilted in prayer. His hands are folded but inverted, his fingers tensely interlocked with palms facing downward.<sup>281</sup> All others are off to the side, away from the vertical axis formed by Christ and Lazarus, and are linked to Lazarus only by the unwrapped shroud that stretches from the grave to the African woman in front of Mary and Peter.<sup>282</sup>

---

<sup>280</sup> Not only Lastman but most of the other "Pre-Rembrandtists," such as Jacob Pynas (Milwaukee), his brother Jan Pynas (1615, Philadelphia) and Jan Tegnagel (1615, Copenhagen) follow this vein closely in their examples painted in Amsterdam while Lievens was working under Lastman. In a 1623 painting of *Lazarus*, the Haarlem Catholic Pieter de Grebber (1623, Bruges), a painter who otherwise influenced Lievens, painted Lazarus as borne up fully by the hands of the disciples and, seemingly, the prayers of the two Marys. De Grebber shows how clearly the story could be used to represent Counter-Reformation doctrines. A later version by De Grebber (1632, Turin), however, seems to follow Lievens's composition. Guratzsch II pl. 135, and *Rembrandt I Jego Krag*, exh. cat. (Warsaw: Muzeum Narodowe, 1956), Nr. 2.

<sup>281</sup> *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 86. Fritz Saxl, "Rembrandt und Italien," *Oud Holland* 41 (1923/1924), 146. Saxl posited that Lievens's Christ figure was based on Mary in Guido Reni's *Pietà dei Mendicanti* (1616, Bologna), but that figure prays with the standard gesture of folded hands with palms upward. There is no indication given of how Lievens might have known of Reni's composition.

<sup>282</sup> In Rembrandt's painting, Christ stands on the slab directly over the tomb. Lazarus's head appears in Rembrandt's painting, and is to the right rather than directly below him as in Lievens's arrangement. Most

Lievens combined the moment when Christ looks up to heaven and petitioned the Father, "...Jesus raised his eyes..." (John 11: 41), with that of Lazarus stirring to life below him, "The man who died came forth..." (John 11: 44).<sup>283</sup> By completely isolating Christ, Lievens makes it clear that Christ is the sole agent through whom God gives salvation to Lazarus, in accordance with Calvinist understanding of grace and salvation.<sup>284</sup>

Calvinist Protestants read the Lazarus miracle as an example of God giving grace freely out of love (Lazarus was the friend of Jesus) rather than in exchange for any merit in the person who was saved. By reducing the figure of Lazarus to two ethereal arms lifted directly to heaven above the rim of the sarcophagus, Lievens expresses that Lazarus has no substance or merit or strength of his own to participate in his own revivification.<sup>285</sup> He evacuates the form of Lazarus of all substance or strength, showing only the arms

---

of the amazed bystanders crouch over the tomb directly in front of Christ, who lifts his right arm, seemingly drawing the stirring and barely conscious Lazarus to life. A sword and quiver of arrows hang over the tomb to the right, alluding to the legend that Lazarus had been a soldier. In his print of 1632 (Bartsch 73), Rembrandt placed Christ with his back to the viewer on the near side of the tomb, with most of the bystanders on the other side of the stirring Lazarus, achieving some of the sense of isolation in Lievens's composition, along with its Protestant sensibility.

<sup>283</sup> *The Raising of Lazarus by Rembrandt*, 22.

<sup>284</sup> The teachings are found in the confessions adopted by the controversial 1618 synod: Guy de Brès's *Confession* to Philip II of 1561 (Articles 5, 7, 22 and 26) and the catechism commissioned by Frederick III of the Palatinate from Heidelberg theologians Caspar Olevianus and Zacharius Ursinus in 1563.

<sup>285</sup> Guratzsch I, 145-151. Klessmann argued that Lievens's print was far more theatrical than even Rembrandt's, pointing to the dramatic light and stage-like setting which he thought were used only to further dramatize the story. *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 84-86. Astrid Tümpel saw the broad swath of the shroud as a superficial effect that explained why Lievens lost the commission to Rembrandt, "With these effects he shows himself only as a baroque director without profundity, superficial, without feeling for the spiritual and religious grounding of the biblical narrative." Werner Sumowski, rev. of *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 11. Sumowski reported on the proceedings of the Exhibition's Symposium as well. As William H. Halewood, noted, Lievens's compositional innovations tended to be more iconographic than formal. William H. Halewood, *Six Subjects of Reformation Art: A Preface to Rembrandt* (Toronto:University of Toronto, 1982), 48.

reaching up, and these are rendered as nearly spectral.<sup>286</sup> And, by depicting Lazarus's shroud (denoting death) as completely removed, Lievens symbolically suggests the fullness of Christ's miracle, including the complete removal of death and sin.<sup>287</sup>

Lievens's painting of the *Raising of Lazarus* postdates his print by a year (Sum. 1193, 1631, Brighton, fig. 66), and reproduces it, rather than the more usual order by which a print reproduces a painting. This indicates that Lievens first designed the composition as a print, and the success of the print then generated demand for an autograph painted version. In the painting the composition is reversed, with Christ and Lazarus on the left side, but otherwise Lievens generally followed the original composition sketch for his print carefully.<sup>288</sup> The most significant change is that the setting of the painting is almost completely dark except for the figures' hands, faces, and the dramatic swath of shroud. The dramatic aureole around Christ in the print is replaced by a faintly glowing aura, resulting in an image of great simplicity and austerity.<sup>289</sup> The

---

<sup>286</sup> Halewood, 41. Halewood emphasizes God's "self-lowering" or humanization, in the so-called "Reformation" subject of Rembrandt (and Lievens), without realizing the extent to which Lievens had gone, hinting at it by taking note of what he sees as the "concentration" of Lievens's composition.

<sup>287</sup> The German reformer Martin Luther interpreted Lazarus's shroud as symbolic of the sin in which each sinner was completely bound up ("bound hand and foot with wrappings, and his face was wrapped around with a cloth"). This may be why Lievens showed the complete removal of shroud. Halewood, 40.

<sup>288</sup> Royalton-Kisch, 271. The x-ray revealed that Lievens recycled the panel and painted *The Raising of Lazarus* over a completed *tronie* similar to his Bathsheba figures of this period. Richard Rand, *The Raising of Lazarus by Rembrandt* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991), 33-36.

<sup>289</sup> The chronological sequence of Lievens's versions of *Lazarus* (Sum. 1193, 1631, Brighton and Holl. 7) and Rembrandt's painting (Bredius 538, Los Angeles) and print (Bartch 73) was deliberately confused by Rembrandt himself by his inaccurate date of 1630 on his drawn copy of a Jacob Louys's copy after Lievens's print that Rembrandt later revised into an *Entombment of Christ* (Benesch 17, London). Otto Benesch, *The Drawings of Rembrandt: complete edition*, rev. E. Benesch, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973). This re-dating was best explained by Royalton-Kisch as a reference to the date of the invention of the theme by Lievens (Benesch 17). Schwartz, 90. Royalton-Kisch, 271. Schwartz notes that Rembrandt also retroactively dated his 1629 *Samson and Delilah* (1629, Amsterdam) to 1628. Rembrandt published copies of Lievens's c. 1631 *Diverse Tronikens* series of etchings as his own as well, in the mid-1630s. *Rembrandt: A Genius and His Impact*, exh. cat. (Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria, 1997), 226.

painting, originally vertical like the print, was cut down in size at an early stage, diminishing the dominance of the axis of Lazarus, Christ and the unseen Father above. The emphasis that now falls on the miracle itself was not Lievens's intention.

In this work Lievens broke decisively with the iconographic tradition of Lazarus with a unique and original composition of great clarity. He chose the most emotional moment in the story, and showed Christ literally wrenching his hands in grief at the death of his friend. His ambition was to create a work that would persuade Huygens of his ability to show emotions in a history painting.

Lievens's *Lazarus* is a pictorial emblem of the Calvinist doctrines of salvation by grace and faith alone, through Christ alone. These teachings were basic to the Counter-Reformation confessional system adopted by the National Synod of the Reformed church in 1618-19.<sup>290</sup> Lievens's goal was to make an image that was clearly adapted to the religious situation and polemics of his day, and that he even participated in (see my comments above on *Feast of Esther*). Unlike Prince Maurits, however, Frederik Hendrik was not a Counter-Reformation partisan and neither was Huygens. Whereas Huygens prized Rembrandt's depiction of emotions in his 1629 *Judas*, Lievens's *Lazarus* was motionless, contained, and austere, and could only have confirmed Huygens in the judgment he made between the two painters and privately recorded in his 1629 autobiography.<sup>291</sup>

---

<sup>290</sup> The reductions or "solas" originated in or started with Luther's assertion of the unique revelatory validity of Scripture at the Diet of Worms in 1521, and the addition of the word "only" into his German Bible translation to assert that salvation was to be gained by faith alone.

<sup>291</sup> A painting attributed to Aert de Gelder (who worked with Rembrandt from 1661-c. 1663) closely followed Lievens's composition, another indication that the painting now in Brighton was the one mentioned in Rembrandt's final inventory. The horizontal format of De Gelder's painting suggests that the Brighton painting may have already been cut down by about 1663. Sotheby's New York, Jan 10, 1991, lot 70a, Saul Steinberg Collection. A tondo version of the *Raising of Lazarus* in the manner of C.W. Dietrich

### *Job on the Dung Heap*

The figure of Job in Lievens's large painting *Job on the Dung Heap* (Sum. 1191, 1631, Ottawa, fig. 68) evokes Calvinist notions about Job's miserable condition as sinner and his complete dependence on the grace of God.<sup>292</sup> Wearing only a loincloth, the elderly Job sits on a low pile of straw-laden cattle manure, the ground about him strewn with litter. His hair is disheveled, his body bowed and his arms hang limply, the hands registering faint gestures of helplessness and resignation. Dark horned putti heads, personify the plagues visited on Job, and float at the top to the left while behind Job his wife approaches holding the richly plumed turban and garments that the grieving Job has spurned. She gestures in aversion towards the viewer.<sup>293</sup>

---

in the Steenstra Collection in 1965 (Sumowski Archief) melds the compositions of Lievens and De Gelder. A peculiar instance of the impact of Lievens's composition is the *Raising of Lazarus* by Salvator Rosa with the Mathiesen Gallery in 1991. Luigi Salerno notes the impossibility of Rosa seeing the original, most likely still in Amsterdam in 1696, and surmises that the print must have found its way to Rome. Rosa's panel follows the painting's composition, however, not that of the print. Luigi Salerno, "Due momenti signolari di Salvator Rosa," *Artibus et Historiae* 23 (1991), 126. Lievens's print was copied and published in reverse by Jacob Louys of Haarlem (1595-after 1635). Louy's print after Lievens's *Lazarus* was published by Pieter Soutman in Haarlem. Rembrandt based his drawn copy (British Museum) of Lievens's composition not on Lievens's own print or painting, but on Louys's reproduction of Lievens's painting. Martin Royalton-Kisch, letter to *Master Drawings* 30 (1992): 336-7.<sup>291</sup> In 1662 the poet Jan Vos praised a painting of the *Raising of Lazarus* by Lievens in the distinguished Amsterdam collection of Jan Jacobsz Hinlopen, possibly the version that shortly before had been listed in Rembrandt's inventory of goods of July 25, 1656. Thomas Asselijn, poet and playwright in Amsterdam, owned a painted version by Lievens (Schneider Nr. 31a, now lost). *Oud Holland* 28 (1910), 8. Jonathan Bikker, "The Deutz brothers, Italian paintings and Michiel Sweerts," *Simiolus* 26 (1998): 286. Lievens's invention of the ghostly arms of Lazarus was even echoed in works by other artists of unrelated subjects such as *Marine Battle between Turks and Christians* (London) by Johannes Lingelbach (1622-1674). Additionally, the 1667 inventory of Thomas Asselijn listed a painted version by Lievens (Schneider Nr. 31a, now lost). *Oud Holland* 28 (1910), 8. Bikker, 286.

<sup>292</sup> Klessmann points to the relationship of Lievens's figure of Job and those of St Jerome by Caravaggio (1605-6, Montserrat and 1607, La Valetta), mainly evident in the figure type and treatment of abdomen. It is not clear that Lievens could have had any knowledge of these remotely located works.

<sup>293</sup> Compare the gesture of aversion by Job's wife to the similar one of the young woman in Lievens's

For the figure of Job, Lievens referred to his own type of hermit saint found in *The Penitent St. Jerome* (Sum. 1242, c. 1630/31, Leiden, fig. 69, and Holl. 15, fig. 70), nearly repeating the figure and setting of an almost nude old man in prayer, changing only the hands from Jerome's meditative prayer to Job's open petition.<sup>294</sup> Job's face is derived from Lievens's *tronie* of an old man formerly in Schwerin (Sum 1269, c. 1631, fig. 34). The placement of a full-length figure isolated in a dark amorphous setting and the simplicity of the composition recall the 1629 *Capuchin Monk praying* (Sum. 1238, 1629, Monteviot, fig. 43) and show how dramatically Lievens's style had changed since he painted the c. 1628 *Samson and Delilah* (Sum. 1185, Amsterdam, fig. 55) with its strong, dramatic light and powerful, large-scale half-length figure.

By adding putti that personify the plagues, Lievens embellished the biblical text much more than in the case of his *The Raising of Lazarus*. Lievens also omits details mentioned in the biblical text such as Job's shorn head, his boils and sores, the potsherd, and Lievens substitutes a dung heap for the ashes specified by the text (Job 1:20 and 2: 7,8).<sup>295</sup> Lievens instead focuses on Job's slumped pose, his sagging and aged body and

---

*Youth embracing a young Woman* towards the viewer (c. 1625, formerly Brussels).

<sup>294</sup> In a pendant pair of diamond-shaped paintings of 1616, *Job*, Hendrick Goltzius paired a very rare painted representation of Job with his New Testament counterpart, *Christ as the Man of Sorrows* (1616, Uelzen), following the Medieval typological tradition. For the iconographic tradition leading up to Lievens, see Lawrence W. Nichols, "Job in distress, a newly-discovered painting by Hendrick Goltzius," *Simiolus* 13 (1983), 182-188. Terrien located a painting purportedly in the Musée des Beaux-Arts Anciens in Brussels, done by Vorsterman after a now-lost Rubens painting. It shows Job actively struggling with the demons and contending with his wife. No such painting resides in the Brussels museum, however, and moreover Vorsterman is not known to have made paintings. The work in question may reflect a model for Lievens. Samuel Terrien, *The Iconography of JOB through the Centuries*, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), 187-188. Andor Pigler, *Barokthemen I* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974), 205. Rudolf Oldenbourg, *Peter Paul Rubens* (Munich and Berlin: R. Oldenbourg, 1922), 93.

<sup>295</sup> The iconographic tradition Lievens follows, showing a dung heap rather than ashes, stems from incorrect translations of the Hebrew text. Nichols, 186 n. 20. The "*Staten-vertaling*" or first official

despairing gesture that express his misery and psychological (rather than physical) affliction.<sup>296</sup> Only the beams of light relieve the darkness and squalor and allude to Job's persevering righteousness.

Lievens's was clearly responding to Rembrandt's equally despairing figure in *Jeremiah lamenting the fall of Jerusalem* (Bredius 604, 1630, Amsterdam), a painting that has a similar composition and theme but in which Rembrandt employed a smaller figure scale. While Rembrandt's *Jeremiah* holds his head in his hand in a state of melancholy and is seen from a distance, Lievens's confronts us with Job's suffering. Unlike Rembrandt in his *Jeremiah*, Lievens sets his Job in a broader narrative. The raised hand of Job's wife has typically been read as part of her accusation to Job, "Do you still hold fast to your integrity? Curse God and die!" (Job 2: 9) as she tempts him to reject his righteousness by bringing his rich clothes.<sup>297</sup> Her gesture, could also express aversion to Job's three friends Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar who visit him but add to, instead of mitigating his suffering, by challenging his righteousness over the course of the following forty chapters (Job 2:11 ff). Lievens perhaps cast the viewers in their role, extending to them the moral challenge of the text. The clothing in the hands of Job's wife may also refer to Job's eventual restoration to honor and position (Job 42: 10-17).<sup>298</sup>

---

translation of the Bible into Dutch, commissioned by the National Synod in 1618-19, only appeared in 1637. It correctly translated the term as "asschen." *Biblia dat is De Gantsche H. Schrifture* (1637, Dordrecht: Pieter Keur, 1719).

<sup>296</sup> In his painting of *Job on the Dung Heap* of 1631 (Karlsruhe, fig. 72), the Catholic painter Cornelis Saftleven (1607-1681) cast Job as the traditional type of Saint Anthony tormented by Boschian demons, and Lievens's more earnest and solemn winged putti heads suggest a similar link.

<sup>297</sup> *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 84.

<sup>298</sup> Schwartz found no explanation for Jeremiah's possessions. Schwartz, 100.



As with the suffering figures of *Lazarus* and *Christ on the Cross*, Lievens created Job as an emblem of spiritual introspection.

### ***St. Peter Penitent***

On April 1, 1632, just as Lievens was leaving Leiden, Huygens sent Lievens's painting of *St. Peter Penitent* to Antonius Triest (1576-1657), the bishop of Ghent and a collector and humanist.<sup>299</sup> In a letter sent to the friend who would forward the painting to Triest, Huygens wrote that regretted that Lievens had not given St. Peter a sword "to cut off the ears of the offending bishops."<sup>300</sup> References to the fallibility of St. Peter were popular among the Reformed, and in this now lost painting, the subject of Peter's betrayal was intended to reprimand the Catholic bishops in the Spanish Netherlands for their flagging commitment to the cause of peace.<sup>301</sup> Once again, Lievens showed how effectively he could shape the polemical and spiritual intentions of his compositions to his clients needs, although perhaps not with the level of violence and emotion that Huygens ultimately desired.

---

<sup>299</sup> Cf. the portrait by Teniers of the bishop Triest surrounded by his collection, and being shown a painting of the wounds of Christ. David Teniers II, *Portrait of Antonius Triest, bishop of Ghent and his brother Eugenio* (1652, St. Petersburg). Margret Klinge, *David Teniers de Jonge: Schilderijen, Tekeningen*, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Koninklijke Museum voor Schone Kunsten, 1991), 224.

<sup>300</sup> Schwartz, 98. Huygens expressed further regrets about Lievens painting, writing poems about it to the effect that St. Peter was insufficiently grief-stricken. A stoic St. Peter would have been only too consistent with Lievens's style, however, a marked difference from how Rembrandt often painted such penitential scenes (i.e. in *Judas returning the Thirty Pieces of Silver* (1629, Private Collection)). A recently discovered painting by Lievens, *St. Peter delivered from Prison*, while it cannot be mistaken for the painting Huygens discusses, could perhaps give some notion of what *St. Peter Penitent* looked like, specifically the expressionlessness of St. Peter with his hands folded to the left, in contrast to the smiling angel to the right. Sothebys, London, December 13, 2001, lot 127.

<sup>301</sup> It was commissioned for Louise van der Noot, in Sluis, to be sent to Triest. Schwartz, 98.

## *Portraits historiés*

### *“Soothsayer”*

Lievens made several *portraits historiés* for the courts in The Hague that may have paved the way to courtly patronage London after 1632.<sup>302</sup> The most ambitious was the large “*Soothsayer*” (Sum. 1187, c. 1631, Berlin, fig. 73) for Frederik Hendrik that hung over a fireplace in the Stadhouders’ quarters in The Hague in 1632, “Een stuck schilderrie daer een waerseghster off een heyen in de handt goeder geluck seght” (“a painting of a soothsayer or a gypsy telling fortunes by reading palms”).<sup>303</sup> The painting shows an old woman with a child on her back who has put down a basket and kneels, holding the palm of a richly clad young woman in a chair. Behind is a girl in white and to her right an African woman in silhouette.<sup>304</sup>

The interior setting, striking figure of the young woman and the absence of the usual pickpocket suggest a narrative beyond the standard genre composition of a gypsy

---

<sup>302</sup> Schwartz, 106

<sup>303</sup> *Princely Patrons, The collection of Frederick Henry and Amalia of Solms*, exh. cat. (The Hague: Mauritshuis, 1997), 170. Leonaert Bramer drew a copy of the “*Soothsayer*” between 1642 and 1654. Michiel Plomp, “Een merkwaardige versameling Teekeningen’ door Leonaert Bramer,” *Oud Holland* 100 (1986), 82, 124.

<sup>304</sup> The figure of this African woman occurs again in one of Lievens’s prints (Holl. 66).

fortune-teller that warns against superstition and gullibility.<sup>305</sup> Another explanation put forward by David DeWitt is that Lievens shows a minor episode from Cervantes' *La Gitanella di Madril* (1610). Such a source would account for the details that deviate from gypsy genre scenes.<sup>306</sup> Jacob Cats's translation of the story, "Het Spaanse Heydinnetje", published as part of his popular *Trou-ringh* of 1637, but Lievens's painting was predated by at least three French editions of Cervantes's story.<sup>307</sup> Cervantes tells of the beautiful blond-haired noble girl Preciosa who had been kidnapped as an infant and raised in a gypsy band. She was recognized by Doña Clara, a palm-reading client of her gypsy "grandmother." Motifs such as the African slave and the paper on the gypsy's forehead, however, cannot be explained by this text.<sup>308</sup>

The key to interpreting this scene is the text written on the piece of paper on the forehead of the old fortune-teller is. Sumowski deciphered it as reading "—trea" and Marten Wurfbain read "Spreu---", but unfortunately it is ultimately too damaged to

---

<sup>305</sup> On Jan Steen's *The Gypsy Fortuneteller*, see Peter Sutton, *Northern European Paintings in the Collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia*, (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1990), 314-316.

<sup>306</sup> Ivan Gaskell, "Transformations of Cervantes's 'La Gitanilla' in Dutch Art," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 45 (1982), 263-264.

<sup>307</sup> Gaskell identified Paulus Bor's (1601-1669) *Don Jan and Majombe* (1641, Utrecht) as the first securely dated Dutch painting illustrating Cervantes's story. Gaskell, 263 note 3, 267, 268.

<sup>308</sup> David DeWitt, "A Scene from Cervantes in the Stadhouder's Collection: Lievens's *Gypsy Fortuneteller*," *Oud Holland* 113 (1999), 183. Maarten Wurfbain proposed that the seated figure is a ten-year old Bohemian prince Maurice, the fourth son of the Winter Queen, in the guise of King Lemuel of Solomon's Proverbs, listening to "the oracle which his mother taught him" (Proverbs 31:1). The client's pearl-drop earrings and headdress are clearly those of a woman, however. The headdress is nearly identical to the one in Gerrit van Honthorst's portrait of Amalia van Solms of c. 1631 (The Hague), with billowing ribbons tied to a filigree tiara, although without the string of pearls. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the gypsy's client is a young man or boy. Maarten Wurfbain, "The Soothsayer by Jan Lievens in Berlin" An Attempt at Interpretation," *Rembrandt, Rubens and the Art of their time: Recent Perspectives*, Roland E. Fleischer and Susan Clare Scott, eds. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 238.

read.<sup>309</sup> The face of the seated woman bears a distinct resemblance to that of Amalia van Solms in Honthorst's portrait of 1631 (The Hague, fig. 74), and Rembrandt's portrait of 1632 (Bredius 99, Paris, fig. 75). Her chin, eyes, eyebrow and nose are especially similar those in Lievens's figure. This gypsy scene was perhaps commissioned by Amalia van Solms, which accords with both Lievens's growing status as a court painter and portraitist and with the court taste for *portraits hitorieuses*.

### The Getty double Portrait

The *portrait historiée Prince Karl-Ludwig von der Pfalz taught by Wolrad von Plessen as Alexander taught by Aristotle* (Sum. 1186, 1631, Los Angeles, fig. 76) remains the high point of Lievens's work in The Hague c. 1631. There was a vogue for such *portraits hitorieuses* in The Hague, especially at the court of the exiled Bohemian monarchs Frederick V (1596-1632) and Elizabeth Stuart, and in the Stadhouder's court. Lievens's 1631 *Gypsy Fortuneteller*, for instance, served as chimneypiece in the Nordeinde Palace, where a number of Honthorst's *portraits hitorieuses* were also installed. The genre was no less popular in London, for example Honthorst's grand *Charles I and Henrietta Maria as Apollo and Diana welcoming the Muses into England* featured the Duke of Buckingham as Mercury (1627, Hampton Court, fig. 78). It was painted for Elizabeth's brother Charles I and installed as backdrop to the throne in the Banqueting Hall at Whitehall. Upon his return to Holland that same year, Frederik Hendrik

---

<sup>309</sup> The device of a paper label attached to the forehead occurs in a few other instances in the orbit of Lievens: two *tronies* of c. 1632 by Paulus de Lesire. One depicts the *Cumean Sibyl* (Sumowski 1142, The Hague) and the other depicts the Jewish philosopher *Philon* (Sumowski III, Nr. 1143, Basel).

commissioned from Honthorst a closely related work, *Amalia von Solms and her entourage as Diana and her Attendants* (c. 1627, lost), showing how closely courtly taste in The Hague and London were linked.<sup>310</sup>

While the enduring fashion for the *portrait historiée* in The Hague may have prompted the ambitious Lievens to take up the genre, his painting of the Prince and his tutor was still unusual example, who subject was not always been clearly identifiable.<sup>311</sup> For some time they were thought to show Eli and the young Samuel, like the pendant-pair mate *Prince Rupert of the Palatinate and his Tutor as Eli and Samuel* (Sum. 244, c. 1631, Los Angeles, fig. 77) produced by Rembrandt's workshop.<sup>312</sup> Although the ages of the sitters and their characters are consistent with the biblical story, the laurel wreath on Charles Ludwig's head and his tutor's chain of office indicate that they must represent Aristotle teaching the young Alexander, however.

Prince Charles Ludwig was the oldest surviving son of King Frederick V of Bohemia and lived in Leiden in 1631, when the portrait was made. Oliver Millar identified the painting as showing the Prince with his teacher Wolrad von Plessen (1560-1632).<sup>313</sup> The prince and his tutor seem to stare past each other with a self-absorption not out of character for the roles of the two larger-than-life historical figures they represent, but which principally emphasizes that the material being taught enters the hearer's imagination (as reinforced by Plessen's gesture). Huygens admired Lievens's ability to

---

<sup>310</sup> Gerrit van Honthorst, *Amalia von Solms and her entourage as Diana and her attendants* (lost). Rose Wishnevsky, *Studien zum "Portrait Historiée" in den Niederlande.*, Diss. U. Munich, 1967, 76.

<sup>311</sup> Wishnevsky, 6.

<sup>312</sup> Ernst van de Wetering, in *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 326-331.

<sup>313</sup> *Gods, Saints and Heroes. Dutch Painting in the Age of Rembrandt*, exh. cat. (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1980), 156.

capture precisely the same quality of reflectiveness in Lievens's portrait of him (Sum. 1286, 1628/9, on loan to Amsterdam, fig. 20).<sup>314</sup> Lievens again succeeded in capturing an elusive quality in this double portrait.

The nobility or regal grandeur that Lievens gives Charles Louis approaches self-absorption and even vanity, a quality that comes to characterize more of his early portraits and *tronies* and that creeps into other compositions. In this portrait Lievens displayed the kind of character and ability that Huygens sought out and promoted.<sup>315</sup> While Lievens failed to gain the *Passion* commission that went to Rembrandt, he succeeded with *portraits historiés*, which corresponds to Huygens's analysis of each artist's strengths. Furthermore, Lievens's portraits of both Huygens and Charles Ludwig formed a suitable *entrée* to the court of Charles I in London.

Although he began working in Leiden as a bold and fashionable Caravaggesque genre painter, Lievens soon modeled his career after Rubens and took up an artistic dialogue with the works of Rubens he knew through prints, Carleton's collection in The Hague and even examples in Leiden collections as early as 1621. He also fell into an intense and groundbreaking artistic friendship with Rembrandt. Lievens's paintings were in the collections of the Stadhouder and court officials, probably even before Constantijn Huygens met him in 1628. Huygens himself also patronized Lievens for history paintings as well and directed him to patronage at both courts at the Hague as well as introducing him to Van Dyck, who ushered Lievens into the next stages of his career in

---

<sup>314</sup> *Gods, Saints and Heroes*. 156. Leerintveld, 168.

<sup>315</sup> As Ernst van de Wetering posited, Huygens may have assigned the two *portraits historiés* to the two painters. *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 331. He perhaps arranged a competition between Rembrandt and Lievens that corresponds to the structure of his diary notes about them that emulated Pliny's account of Xeuxis and Parrhassius, as Jan Białostocki noted in *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 14.

London and Antwerp. The accounts of Huygens, Orlers and Angel give us an extraordinarily nuanced and intimate appraisal of Lievens's formative years, his early work, his self-confidence, his incisiveness and his ambitions. He continued responding to and assimilating the work of the most advanced artists of his day.

## Chapter 2: Lievens in England, 1632-1635

Around 1631 or 1632, Constantijn Huygens almost certainly introduced Lievens to Anthony van Dyck in The Hague. The manifold effects of Lievens's encounter with Van Dyck would unfold over the following years as he pursued the most promising avenue to become a great painter after the model of Rubens: going to the court in England. Although Van Dyck's personal influence, his flattering inclusion of Lievens in the *Iconographia* series and his move to London in 1632 were strong inducements for Lievens to move to London, he had already declared his intention to go to England in early 1629. On April 10 of that year, Lievens petitioned the city guard of Leiden to release him from his obligation to serve on the night watch for a period of three months in order to finish a painting commissioned by the Stadhouder.<sup>316</sup> He promised to make up this time if he did not, at the end of three months, carry out his plan to travel to England.<sup>317</sup>

Lievens's reputation preceded him to the Stuart court since his *Student reading by a Turf Fire* (Sch. 116, before 1628, lost), which was bought by Frederik Hendrik and

---

<sup>316</sup> "Mr. Jan Lievens, schilder, ter vergadering aengedient hebbende dat hij van meening was geweest nu eerstdaechs van hier van Leyden te vertrekken naer Engelant, maer dat hij opt versouck van den Prins van Oraingen een stuck schilderie onder hant hadde daeraen hy noch omtrent de drye maenden werck hadde, en daerhalve syn reys ofte vertreck soo lange moste uytstellen, versouckende derhalve date de Heeren hem uytte schutterie voor die tijt wilde ontslaan, onder conditie dat zoo hy nae d'expiratie van de voorss. drye maenden nyet en vertrock, dat hy alsdan hem vrywillichlich onder de schutterie soude begeven en syn nachtwachte warnemen...soo is dat Hooftmans den zelve Jan Lievens uytte voorss. schutterie voor den tijt van drye maenden hebben ontslagen, mits dat hij midderlertijt vertrecke off hij aldien hy hier langer blyve dat hij alsdaen wederom syne nachtwachte sal waernemen en betaelen alle boeten van wachten vant Rot daerinne hy alreede is gestelt, en is hem sulx aengeseyt en oock ten danck aengenomen." *Journaal der Leische Schutterij*, 10 April 1629, in E. W. Moes, "Jan Lievens," *Leids Jaarboekje* (1907), 142-143. Schneider, 3,4.

<sup>317</sup> Schneider, 4.



brought to England by Sir Robert Kerr, had been given to Charles I.<sup>318</sup> In 1631 Lievens made an *portrait historiée* for Elisabeth, sister of Charles I, *Prince Charles Louis of the Palatinate with his Tutor Woldrad von Plessen as the young Alexander being instructed by Aristotle* (Sum. 1286, Los Angeles, fig. 76) and Lievens doubtlessly obtained the commission through his offices, and he must have devised the conceit. Huygens himself had lived in England in 1618-19 and again from 1621-1624.

Lievens's motivations for moving to England shortly after February 1, 1632, were tied to his ambitions to be a court painter, as Jan Janz Orlers recorded in his 1641 *Beschrijvinge der Stadt Leyden*, writing that Lievens's decision to move to England was based on his desire to see another country and to search out its opportunities:

“Lust ende begeerte krijgende, om eens een ander Landt ende de ghelegentheyte van dien te besien, so is hy inden Jare 1631. oudt sijnde ontrent 24. Jaeren naer Engelandt vertrocken...”<sup>319</sup>

(“On getting the desire and yearning to once see another land and its opportunities, so in the year 1631, being about 24 years old, he departed for England...”)<sup>320</sup>

Though Lievens had trained as a history painter and had already achieved remarkable successes in that genre, he is not recorded as having produced a single history painting in England. Only a few portraits and landscapes are recorded.

The two portrait prints Lievens made in England show him adapting almost completely to Van Dyck's portrait style, confirming the evidence of the surviving

---

<sup>318</sup> Schneider, 120.

<sup>319</sup> Orlers, in Schneider, 294. Lievens was documented in Leiden, on August 13, 1639, when he retrieved his maternal inheritance, as “woonende binnen Leyden” (“currently residing in Leyden”). Orlers could have consulted with him at that time. Bredius I, 196.

<sup>320</sup> Translation mine.

drawings and his work in Antwerp immediately after his English stay, which show his complete absorption of the Flemish master's style. It is certainly possible that in England Lievens worked alongside Van Dyck, perhaps as a member of his studio.

In London Lievens succeeded in gaining the patronage of the King, independently painting both him and members of his family. Orlers mentioned in his *Beschrijvinge* of 1641,

“... alware hy terstont door zijn constige wercken vermaert geworden is, zelfs by zijne Majesteyt, de welcke hy met de Coninginne zijn Huysvrouwe, den Prince van Wallis zijn zoon, ende de Princesse zijn Dochter, mitsgaders vele groote Heeren gheconterfeyt heeft. Daer over hy by de Coning van Groot-Britangen rijckelicken beloont is.”<sup>321</sup>

(“...where he, thanks to his artful works immediately became famous, even to His Majesty the King, who he portrayed with his wife the Queen, the Prince of Wales his son and the Princess his daughter, together with many great Lords. He was richly paid by the King of Great-Britain for these.”)<sup>322</sup>

Two of the royal portraits Orlers listed were catalogued by the King's keeper, Abraham van der Doort, as being in the King's collection in 1639: one of Charles I himself (Sch. 260, c. 1633) and the other of his children (Sch. 298, c. 1633). This documented output of two portraits is also too meager for a young man acclaimed by Huygens for his

---

<sup>321</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 137.

<sup>322</sup> The authors of the 1991 Leiden catalogue translate Orlers's passage as follows, “On feeling the urge to see another country and other customs, Lievens went to England in 1631, at the age of about 24, where his fine works gained his immediate acclaim. His fame was noted by the king himself, whom he portrayed with his consort the queen, his son the Prince of Wales, his daughter the princess, as well as several great Lords. For this he was richly rewarded by the king of England.” Orlers, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*. 137. In the original Dutch of Orlers's passage, however, no “customs” are mentioned but rather his opportunity to see another country arrives. Furthermore, Orlers wrote that Lievens painted “vele” (“many”) great Lords, not just several.

“indefatigable application to diligent labor.”<sup>323</sup> Just as Adriaen Hanneman probably worked in Van Dyck’s studio at Blackfriars, so too must have Lievens.<sup>324</sup> Lievens mentions having painted many (“vele”) great Lords, and the discrepancy with the number of portraits known can only point to his having worked for Van Dyck.<sup>325</sup>

This chapter will first discuss how Lievens’s experience in England fit into the wider context of Dutch and Flemish artists working in England in the 1620s and 1630s and Lievens’s motivations and prospects for moving to England. It will then review the evidence of Lievens’s English trip and the works he produced there, both the lost paintings and surviving works. Through the surviving works we can trace Lievens’s complete adoption of Van Dyck’s subject matter and style, and deduce the relationship of the two painters during this period must have been as no documentary evidence survives.

## **Netherlandish Artists in England**

### **Gerrit van Honthorst**

When Lievens arrived in 1632, Dutch and Flemish artists were already established at the English court. Peter Paul Rubens, Anthony van Dyck and Gerrit van Honthorst (1592-1656) had had major commissions there. Honthorst ranked among the most

---

<sup>323</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 134.

<sup>324</sup> Onno ter Kuile, *Adriaen Hanneman 1604-1671, een Haags portretschilder* (Alphen-on-the-Rijn: Canaletto, 1976), 10.

<sup>325</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 137.

successful artists in Holland even before he traveled to London in 1628. Prior to visiting England, Honthorst lived in Rome (c.1610-20) and had served Cardinal Vincenzo Giustiniani as court painter. Upon his return to Utrecht in 1620, he attracted work from patrons in England and Holland. The English Ambassador Sir Dudley Carleton had already sent an example of his work to England in 1621.<sup>326</sup> Honthorst established a large workshop in Utrecht, which Rubens visited in 1627 on his way to England. Sir Dudley Carleton recommended Honthorst to the prominent collector the Earl of Arundel, but it was the Duke of Buckingham's advisor, Balthasar Gerbier, who induced him to come to England.<sup>327</sup> Although Lievens's arrival in London was preceded by the King's acquisition of an example of his work, unlike Honthorst, there is no evidence that Lievens was invited by an English patron.

Honthorst stayed with Buckingham in London for eight months in 1628 and enjoyed great success. He painted there the most ambitious work of his career, *Charles I and Henrietta Maria as Apollo and Diana welcoming the Muses to England* (Hampton Court, fig. 78), a massive work that was intended to serve as backdrop to the throne in the Banqueting Hall at Whitehall.<sup>328</sup> Honthorst did not remain in England long after Buckingham's assassination on August 23. On December 8 Honthorst sailed for Holland, but not without gifts from Charles I, including citizenship, a 100-pound yearly pension, a silver service, and a horse.<sup>329</sup>

---

<sup>326</sup> Marten Jan Bok, "Artists at Work: Their Lives and Livelihood," *Masters of Light*, Joaneath Spicer, ed., exh. cat. (Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1997), 382.

<sup>327</sup> Balthasar Gerbier to George Villiers of April 5, 1628, in Hermann Braun. *Gerard und Willem Van Honthorst*. diss, Göttingen, 1966, 352.

<sup>328</sup> Braun 43, 347.

<sup>329</sup> Joachim von Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie* (1675) in Braun, 385.

After he returned from London, Honthorst moved to The Hague and served as court portraitist, competing with Michiel van Mierevelt (1567-1641) and Anthony van Ravesteyn (c. 1580-1669). As a sought-after and richly rewarded portrait painter, Honthorst's example must have made a strong impact on the young Lievens. Honthorst's work for the King and Queen of Bohemia after his return from London included a family portrait destined for Charles I.<sup>330</sup> The painting Carleton had sent to Arundel in 1621, a fire-lit night scene of *Aeneas fleeing Troy* (lost), was the result of a challenge Honthorst had given to the ambassador to choose any subject for him to paint.<sup>331</sup> This level of bold self-confidence, along with Honthorst's courtly success, would have resonated with Lievens.

### **Daniël Mijtens and Adriaen Hanneman**

Van Dyck's predecessor as court portraitist in London was Daniël Mijtens, (c. 1590-c. 1647) of Delft. Mijtens's clientele in London, besides the King and his family, was very broad, but his rigid and formal style developed little during his appointment. He was supplanted by Van Dyck in 1632 and returned to The Hague in 1634. In 1630, however, he had visited The Hague, at which point Lievens may have had contact with him.

---

<sup>330</sup> Edwin Buijsen, *Haagse Schilders in de gouden eeuw* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1998), 176.

<sup>331</sup> David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his circle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985): 157.

Mijtens had worked for the Earl of Arundel before being retained by the King. His assistant, Adriaen Hanneman (c. 1604-1671), had trained with the portraitist Anthony van Ravestijn in The Hague but unlike Lievens, Mijtens had done little independent work before crossing the channel.<sup>332</sup> In 1626, Hanneman traveled to London and there worked as assistant to Mijtens, until Mijtens left for The Hague in 1634; subsequently he appears to have worked as an assistant to Van Dyck.<sup>333</sup> Thus, he would have worked in Van Dyck's workshop when Lievens was likely there. Hanneman painted portraits of Mijtens and his wife (1634, Woburn Abbey) as well as another Dutch artist, Cornelius Jonson and his wife (1637, Enschede). Jonson, a successful portraitist, worked for Mijtens and in December of 1632 was himself appointed to the court and served until 1643, when he left for Middleburg in Zeeland.<sup>334</sup> Hanneman left for The Hague in 1638 and became the preeminent portraitist there, working in the style of Van Dyck for the rest of his career. He became the principal painter to the Stuarts in exile, producing portraits such as *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (c. 1653, Washington D.C.).<sup>335</sup>

### **Anthony van Dyck**

---

<sup>332</sup> Ter Kuile, 10.

<sup>333</sup> Ter Kuile, 10. Buijsen, 156-159. R.E.O. Ekkart, "Adrian Hanneman," *Grove Dictionary of Art: From Rembrandt to Vermeer*, Jane Turner, ed. (New York: St. Martin's, 2000), 145.

<sup>334</sup> Karen Hearn, "The English career of Cornelius Jonson," 119-120. *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 22* (2003): 119-120.

<sup>335</sup> A. K. Wheelock, *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century* (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1995): 91-94.

The career path of Anthony van Dyck would have reinforced in Lievens the importance of London to career success. In 1620-21 Van Dyck had gone to England through the invitation of Arundel, who had made inquiries about his availability while he still worked for Rubens in Antwerp in 1620. Once in England Van Dyck made the acquaintance of George Villiers, later the Duke of Buckingham, and painted a *portrait historiée* of the Duke and his bride as *The Continnence of Scipio* (fig. 107). Lievens probably saw this painting in England from the evidence of his own version of the subject of 1639 in which he emulated aspects of its composition and figure style. (Sch. 106, destroyed 1929). After traveling to Italy and France from 1621 to 1627, and returning to Antwerp, Van Dyck visited The Hague in 1631-32. He left The Hague in early 1632 and traveled via Brussels to London, arriving by April 1, 1632. He was named court painter to Charles I shortly thereafter.<sup>336</sup> As the last evidence of Lievens's presence in Holland that year was his signature on a document dated February 6, the two men must have arrived in London almost simultaneously.<sup>337</sup> Van Dyck left London again around 1633 while Lievens stayed until 1635.

Lievens had been emulating Rubens's works for years, but in Van Dyck, who he first met in late 1631 or 1632, he would have encountered the very embodiment of his ambitions, the man who Rubens had described in a letter to Carleton in 1618 as one of his best students.<sup>338</sup> By 1631, Van Dyck had achieved international renown. He was court painter to the Archduchess Isabella and was sought after by courts in The Hague and

---

<sup>336</sup> Frans Baudouin, "Van Dyck in the Hague," *Van Dyck 1599-1999: Conjectures and Refutations*, Hans Vlieghe, ed. (Brussels: Brepols, 2001), 61.

<sup>337</sup> Baudouin, 60. Bredius I, 195.

<sup>338</sup> *The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens*, Ruth Saunders Magurn, ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 61.

London. The experience of meeting Van Dyck and seeing him work on his own portrait for the *Iconographia* would have been a deeply impressive, if not overwhelming experience for Lievens.

Almost nothing is known about Van Dyck's assistants in London from 1632-33 beyond their number, because, since he lived in the liberty of Blackfriars, he was free from guild regulations as well as from record keeping.<sup>339</sup> Van Dyck was then absent from London before March 28, 1634 until June 1635, when he traveled to the Southern Netherlands. He stayed in Brussels until the arrival of the new governor, Archduke Ferdinand, who entered the city in November 1634.<sup>340</sup> In his absence, the London workshop remained in action, indicating the presence of competent workshop assistants, one of whom was probably Lievens.<sup>341</sup>

### **Lievens's works in England**

#### **Van der Doort's catalogue**

Unfortunately, during the time he was in England from 1632 to 1635, no documents mention Jan Lievens. The records of the Dutch church in London, Austin

---

<sup>339</sup> Olivar Millar, "Van Dyck in London," *Anthony van Dyck*, Arthur K. Wheelock Jr., ed., 56. Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, exh. cat. (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1982), 29-30.

<sup>340</sup> Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, 32, 33.

<sup>341</sup> The names of some of Van Dyck's own copyists such as Regidius van Leemput, Jan van Belcamp and George Geldorp are known. Van Dyck explained to the collector Everhard Jabach his method of producing large numbers of portraits, but the names of the workshop assistants are not recorded. Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, 29-31.



Friars, twice mention a Jan or John Lievens, but these names occur in the register after 1637. Significantly, from 1635 to 1644 Jan Lievens of Leiden is confirmed to have been in Antwerp.<sup>342</sup> The only English records of his stay, then, are the royal portraits listed in Van der Doort's inventories of the collection of Charles I and the records of their sale from that collection in 1649.

Van der Doort listed two painted portraits by Lievens. One was a portrait of the King and the other was a portrait of Prince Charles and Princess Mary, "hand in hand."<sup>343</sup> The paintings are lost but are nearly identical to the references in Orlers's list, "...His Majesty the King, who he portrayed with his wife the Queen, the Prince of Wales his son and the Princess his daughter, together with many great Lords."<sup>344</sup> The close similarity between these two independently recorded accounts of Lievens's works done in London, especially in the description of the portrait of Charles and Mary, affirms that Orlers's account was correct. In all probability the paintings of many great Lords Lievens claims to have executed were portraits he worked on while in the workshop of Anthony van Dyck.

The portrait of Charles I went to a certain Lady Jening in return for the Wilton Diptych, a late fifteenth-century work showing Richard II before the Virgin (National Gallery, London), which Van der Doort listed as having been received from a certain James Palmer "...who had it of the Lo: Jenings." Neither Palmer nor Jening(s) have been identified but they must have had some connection to the Earl of Pembroke. The diptych

---

<sup>342</sup> Christopher Brown, "Jan Lievens in Leiden and London," *Burlington Magazine* CXXXI (1980): 670.

<sup>343</sup> Brown, 670. O. Millar, "Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I," *Proceedings of the Walpole Society* 37 (1958-59):146, 161.

<sup>344</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

came from Pembroke's collection and Charles I had exchanged other precious paintings with Pembroke, including ones by Holbein. This exchange involving the diptych and the Lievens portrait is mentioned twice in the inventories made by Van der Doort:

“...and was Coppied of yor Mats little guilt old alter peece wch yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> had of the lady Jening by Sir James Palmers means for the w<sup>ch</sup> in the way of Exchang yo<sup>u</sup> gave your owne Picture in oyle Collo<sup>rs</sup> don by Leevons.”<sup>345</sup>

and again:

“giffen to de king bij S<sup>r</sup> jams pamer hu had it auff mulade chening in reckompense terauff te king grantit tu S<sup>r</sup> jams pamr tu giff de sijd ladi chani de pitur Werontu de king had sit in tu liffens.”<sup>346</sup>

The keeper of the King's Collection had been zealous and inquisitive in his office, but was frustrated by court intrigues and his lack of free access to all areas in the palaces where art was kept.<sup>347</sup> Thus, his fastidious records have to be considered incomplete and the possibility remains open that additional works by Lievens, such as the portrait of the Queen mentioned by Orlers, escaped his listings.

### ***The King's Giant Porter***

---

<sup>345</sup> Van der Doort, Windsor MS, f. 112, Nr. 20, in Millar, “Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue,” 146.

<sup>346</sup> Van der Doort, Windsor MS, f. 132, Nr. 11, in Millar, “Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue,” 161.

<sup>347</sup> Millar, “Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue,” xvi.

The only contemporary comment on Lievens's activity in London that survives occurs in two lines of poetry written by Constantijn Huygens on February 24, 1633, approximately a year after Lievens left for London,

“IN EFFIGIEM MAGNI IANITORIS REGIS ANGLIAE  
MANU I. LIVIJ  
Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens cui lumen  
ademptum  
Si foret, Anglorum jam Polyphemus erit.”  
24. Feb. (1633)<sup>348</sup>

(“On the portrait of the giant Porter of the King of England by the hand of J. Livij. Horrible huge hideous monster, deprived of sight, he would be the current Polyphemus of the English, in case there were one.”)<sup>349</sup>

This poem is an example of Huygens's many epigrams on paintings that formed part of his daily practise of writing. It is also a good example of the kind of rhetorical emulation Quintillian commended. Huygens barely altered the description of the giant Polyphemus in the third book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. His words were thus high praise for the powerful effect and realism of Lievens's work, the same qualities he had so valued in Rembrandt's *Judas*.<sup>350</sup> It is not clear how Huygens knew of the portrait (Sch. 299, lost) but he wrote the poem when in The Hague. Huygens must have maintained contact with Lievens

---

<sup>348</sup> Schwartz, 96. This compliment is contrasted to a series of derogatory epigrams on Rembrandt's portrait of Jacques de Gheyn III written a week before, on February 18, 1633. *De Gedichten Van Constantijn Huygens, naar zijn handschrift* II. Edited by Dr. J. A. Worp (Groningen: 1893), 246.

<sup>349</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>350</sup> Schwartz calls the distych “polite” but in fact by resorting to Virgil Huygens renders Lievens much higher praise. Huygens emulated the lines concerning the first appearance of the cyclops Polyphemus in the *Aeneid*, “Vix erat fatus ea cum, summo monte, videmus pastorem Polyphemus ipsum, moventum se vasta mole inter pecudes, et petentem nota litora, horrendum monstrum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.” (“Scarcely had he spoken these things when, on the top of a mountain, we behold the shepherd Polyphemus himself, moving himself with gigantic bulk among the flocks, and seeking the familiar shores, a terrible monster, misshapen, huge, whose eye was put out”) (Book 3: 655). *Virgil's Aeneid, the original Latin text with an interlinear English translation*, Frederick Holland Dewey, trans. (New York: Translation Publishing, 1917), 147-148. Schwartz, 96.

while he was in England. Since Huygens mentioned this painting in 1633, it must have been one of Lievens's earliest English works.<sup>351</sup>

The King's giant porter was William Evans, who in fact served the Queen at Denmark House, and was part of her inner circle of staff.<sup>352</sup> Although the portrait of Evans does not survive, it is consistent with Lievens's other London portraits in that it depicts a member of the court of Charles I.

### Portraits on paper

Huygens had described Lievens as an industrious artist. It comes as a surprise, then, that he is only documented to have executed so little work, only two portrait prints, a few commissioned portrait paintings (all lost) and a small number of portrait drawings during his three years in England. Lievens had gone to London with the clear intention to be a court artist and soon realized that engaging in portraiture was critical to success. The two etched portraits that date to Lievens's stay in London depict a certain Robert South (Holl. 28, c. 1633, fig. 79) and Jacques Gaultier, the court lutenist (Holl. 23, c. 1634, fig. 81). Lievens also published a third image of the court musician Nicolas Lanier that was engraved by Lucas Vorsterman after a painting by Lievens (fig. 82).<sup>353</sup> These

---

<sup>351</sup> Schneider saw a connection to, or confusion with, the portrait of the so-called "Queen Elisabeth's Giant Porter," dated 1580 and today at Hampton Court Palace and thought to be by Cornelis Ketel. Schneider, 161. C. H. Colins Baker, *Catalogue of the Pictures at Hampton Court* (Glasgow: University Press, 1929), 83 (Inv. 4). That gigantic painting shows a young man.

<sup>352</sup> Nick Page, *Lord Minimus: The extraordinary life of Britain's smallest man* (New York: St. Martin's, 2001), 49.

<sup>353</sup> Lucas Vorsterman, after Jan Lievens, *Nicolas Lanier* (Holl XLIII 168, c. 1634/5).

portrait prints and drawings demonstrate that Lievens gradually adapted the kind of portraiture Van Dyck produced with its emphasis on authoritative presence and gracefulness.<sup>354</sup> An additional debt to Van Dyck was Lievens's adoption of Van Dyck's printmakers Martinus van den Enden, who published Lievens's portrait of Gaultier, and Lucas Vorsterman, who published that of Lanier, both published prints for Van Dyck's *Iconographia*.<sup>355</sup> The publication of Lievens's prints involved sending designs to Van Dyck's printmakers in Antwerp, two men with whom Lievens had never previously worked.<sup>356</sup>

### **“Robert South”**

The subject of the c. 1633 print of “Robert South” (Holl. 28, fig. 79) is identified by its inscription in French on two impressions of the second state, identifying the sitter as the 112-year old Englishman: “Jean Livius fec. Robert South Anglois âgé de cent douze ans.” The bald, coarse and imposing bearded man seems to lean slightly back from the viewer, his shoulders relaxed as if sitting in a chair. With its empty background

---

<sup>354</sup> The print of South and the first states of the print of Gaultier were etched by Lievens. Only in later states was engraving added to the print of Gaultier. *Jan Lievens 1607-1674, Prints & Drawings*, 58. Schatborn posits that the lack of a colophon inscription on the print of South indicates that Lievens published it himself. C. Ackley's view, that the South print is a product of Lievens's Antwerp period, corresponding in style to *Fighting Card Players and Death*. (Holl. 19), seems improbable considering the inscription and the many more correspondences to *tronies* prior to 1632 (Holl. 27, 30, 31) than to his portraits made later in Antwerp of Brouwer, Seghers and De Heem.

<sup>355</sup> *Jan Lievens 1607-1674, Prints & Drawings*, 57, Nr. 35.

<sup>356</sup> That the experienced printmaker Lievens would suddenly take up portrait prints after Van Dyck's visit to The Hague in 1631/1632 further suggests that Lievens first met him at that time, and not a decade earlier as Stewart suggests. J. Douglas Stewart, “Before Rembrandt's ‘Shadow’ fell: Lievens, Van Dyck and Rubens: Some Reconsiderations.” *Hoogsteder Mercury* II (1990), 42-47.

and highly detailed description, it is similar to *tronie* paintings and prints that Lievens designed in Leiden, such as *Bust of an Oriental Man in front* (Holl. 36, c. 1630-32, fig. 80). The proud sitter confronts the viewer with inescapable directness. Recalling the story of the purportedly 151-year-old Thomas Parr, whom the Earl of Arundel brought to London in September 1635 and who survived briefly at Denmark House, Lievens's print suggests some connection to the courtly taste for oddities.<sup>357</sup>

In the two subsequent portrait prints, which depicted renowned musicians to the court of Charles I, Lievens imitated Van Dyck's *Iconographia*, a series of portrait prints of "illustrious men" that Van Dyck began after 1628.<sup>358</sup> Van Dyck had etched the first prints in the series by his own hand, but by 1632 made oil sketches and pass these on to a printmaker who issued reproductive prints. Lievens etched the *Robert South* print himself, then produced the print of Gaultier himself using a combination of etching and engraving (*fecit et excudit*) before having it published by Van den Enden.<sup>359</sup> For the print of Lanier, however, Lievens used a painted design ("pinxit") that he sent to Vorsterman (Lievens's later portrait prints would nearly all be based on drawings).

Lievens imitated the style and format of Van Dyck's series in these latter two prints.<sup>360</sup> It is clear that none of Lievens's three prints was ever part of the series by Van

---

<sup>357</sup> Thomas Parr was the "English Methuselah," whose purported dates (1483-1635) made him around 150 years old when Lievens arrived in England, and 151 when he arrived at court in September 1635 (after Lievens had left for Antwerp). Nick Page, 97. Howarth, 172-3. Lievens's print was likely executed around 1633, and Parr came to London after Lievens's departure for Antwerp. South, with his high eyebrows and large wide nose, does not resemble the man in Cornelis van Dalem's etching of Parr, who has low eyebrows and a slender nose.

<sup>358</sup> Robin Blake, *Van Dyck, a life 1599-1641* (London: Constable, 1991), 225.

<sup>359</sup> Quentin Buvelot and Hans Buijs, *A Choice Collection of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Paintings from the Frits Lugt Collection* (The Hague: Mauritshuis, 2003), 209, note 8.

<sup>360</sup> The print of Lanier by Vorsterman after Lievens measures 26.9 x 20.5 cm, that of the printmaker Pieter de Jode II by Vorsterman after van Dyck essentially the same at 26.3 x 18 cm. (Holl. XLIII, 168, 167).

Dyck nor did he seek to initiate a competing series of his own. Lievens's printmaking had involved series such as the *Diverse tronikens* (Holl. 33-36, 39-41, c. 1630, see fig. 38) and the *Four Evangelists* (Holl. 10-13, c. 1630, possibly completed by Laurent de la Hyre). There is, however, no systematic grouping to Lievens's few portrait prints comparable to that of Van Dyck. Lievens probably approached Gaultier and Lanier as friends or associates, and published the prints on speculation.<sup>361</sup>

### **Jacques Gaultier**

The French lutenist Gaultier had arrived in London fifteen years before Lievens.<sup>362</sup> A colorful and violent person, he fled France on suspicion of murder and was arrested on his arrival in London, but then released to the protection of the Duke of Buckingham on account of his talent.<sup>363</sup> Gaultier accompanied the Prince of Wales and Buckingham to Madrid in 1623 on their unsuccessful mission to secure a Spanish match for Charles.<sup>364</sup> He was elevated to court lutenist upon the Prince's ascension to the throne

---

Lievens would continue to make portrait prints in the style of Van Dyck's *Iconographia* in Antwerp and the Northern Netherlands in his portraits of Adriaen Brouwer, Daniel Seghers, Constantijn Huygens, and others.

<sup>361</sup> Lievens inscribed the Gaultier print with a tribute to their friendship. Fred Jacobs, "Jacques Gaultier, 'koninklijk' luitspeler," *Kroniek Van het Rembrandthuis* (2001): 25.

<sup>362</sup> Gaultier fled France under suspicion of having murdered a young nobleman. Jacobs, 25.

<sup>363</sup> Jacobs, 25.

<sup>364</sup> The Duke of Buckingham was a patron of foreign artists, inviting Van Honthorst to England, and also taking Orazio Gentilleschi into his household in 1626. Jeremy Wood, "Orazio Gentilleschi and some Netherlandish artists in London," *Simiolus* 28 (2000/2001): 107.

in 1625 and Lievens portrayed him as a Cavalier, with focus, poise, detachment, and an air of ease, holding his lute at a rakish angle (Holl. 23, c. 1634, fig. 81).

Gaultier's mercurial fortunes and his character, at times priapic, at times apollonian, are worthy of their own opera. He soon took royal favor for granted and was confined once more in the tower prison in 1626 for assaults and indiscretions. Lievens's inscription likening him to Orpheus was apt, as Gaultier's musical abilities pacified his situation and won him a return to Royal favor by the following year that lasted, with one further hiatus, until Charles abandoned London for Oxford in 1642.<sup>365</sup> Gaultier seems to have left England from 1630 to 1634, so Lievens's portrait must have been done in the last year or two of Lievens's stay there, which ended in 1635. Van Dyck, who had portrayed Gaultier while both were in Italy around 1622/23, likely introduced the musician to Lievens in London.<sup>366</sup> Lievens signed the Gaultier print as its maker and publisher (*fecit et excudit*), and an inscription indicates that the print is a monument to his friendship with Gaultier.

In his diary notations for 1622, Constantijn Huygens praised Gaultier with his familiar hyperbole:

“Heavenly Gods, with what driven hands, right and left, he was able to take me periodically outside of my senses. Was that a lute possessed by a god, or really the work and spirit of a man?”<sup>367</sup>

---

<sup>365</sup> Jacobs, 26.

<sup>366</sup> Erik Larsen, “Der Musiker Jacques Gaultier. Zu einem wiedergefundenen Gemälde Antonis Van Dycks,” *Weltkunst* 67 (1997): 700.

<sup>367</sup> Jacobs, 25.



Huygens heard Gaultier perform at the house of the courtier Robert Killigrew during his stay in England from 1621 to 1624 with the diplomat François van Aerssen.<sup>368</sup>

Lievens derived a great many of the elements of this print from Van Dyck's style, such as the elegant and dignified pose, the window and landscape in the background, the off-center composition and the three-quarter length pose. The stippling technique used in Gaultier's face and the use of the profile pose are, however, familiar from Lievens's Leiden period works.<sup>369</sup> Although the profile pose belongs to Lievens's own repertoire, in all other respects the Gaultier portrait marks Lievens's complete transition to Van Dyck's style and method and is startling evidence of his ambition, self-confidence and rapid adaptability to new patrons and circumstances. It also marks Lievens's inclusion in court circles, which could only have happened through Van Dyck.

### **Nicolas Lanier**

Nicolas Lanier, the Master of the Kings Musick, was the subject of Lievens's second Van Dyckian portrait print (fig. 82).<sup>370</sup> Lanier was even more prominent at the court of Charles I than was Gaultier, playing the lute as well as the flute and viol, and was a pioneer in importing an Italian style of music into England. He was also a painter (*Self-*

---

<sup>368</sup> "Constantijn Huygens," [www.dbnl.nl](http://www.dbnl.nl) (Accessed February 1, 2006). In the 1640s and 1650s, Huygens would exchange correspondence with Gaultier concerning the acquisition of instruments he had heard. Jacobs, 25.

<sup>369</sup> Lievens developed and used stippling in his etchings, which seems to be derived from his study of Buytewech prints. *Jan Lievens 1607-1674 Prints & Drawings*, 23.

<sup>370</sup> Susan James, "The Model as Catalyst, Nicolas Lanier and Margaret Lemon," *Jaarboek van het Koninklijke Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerpen* (1999): 71, 79, fig. 5.

*portrait*, 1644, Oxford) and an agent for the King in the transport of the Duke of Mantua's art collection to London, the greatest addition of foreign art to the Royal Collection. This acquisition was especially important for the large proportion of important paintings by the Venetian masters that Charles I loved, and that Van Dyck admired.<sup>371</sup> In contrast to the friendship between Gaultier and Lievens indicated by the inscription on the print of that musician, the Lanier inscription leaves out any reference to Lievens. The inscription "Ioannes Lijvijus pinxit, Lucas Vorsterman sculpsit, Franciscus van den Wingaerde excudit," indicates that Lievens painted the model for the print, thus following the method Van Dyck used for many of the prints in the *Iconographia*.<sup>372</sup>

The composition and style of Lievens's portrait is reminiscent of Van Dyck's painted portrait of Lanier from c. 1626-28 (Vienna, fig. 83).<sup>373</sup> Lievens's print of Lanier has the artificiality of an artfully distant pose. The musician does not hold an instrument, but rather his hat and baton. Lanier sits stiffly upright in a simple chair, posing in a three-quarter turn. His jaw juts forward while he glances slightly downward towards the viewer. His hands express a sense of ease and informality. The brim of the doffed hat is slightly curled up against his thumb while he holds the baton loosely with his index finger against his open thumb and middle finger. In his earlier *tronies* and portraits, Lievens often positioned the head towards the center, but here the figure fills the length of the frame, emphasizing the subject's physical presence. The composition represents

---

<sup>371</sup> James, 80.

<sup>372</sup> Perhaps because it was based on a painting, it was not catalogued by Hollstein or Rovinsky as by Lievens, but rather by Vorsterman. Schneider, 197, Nr. Z. 61. Schneider included it among the drawings despite the inscription indicating a painted model.

<sup>373</sup> James, 78.

Lievens's complete absorption of the style and practice of Van Dyck, suggesting that the painting was probably produced at the end of Lievens's stay in London in 1635.

### **The Turin drawing of Charles I**

In 1974 Werner Sumowski attributed a portrait drawing of Charles I in the Biblioteca Real in Turin to Lievens (Sum. D. 1754xx, fig. 84).<sup>374</sup> The pen drawing was done with the immediacy of a sketch taken directly from the model. As in the Lanier print, the king's figure nearly fills the page, his torso in profile while the face turns to the viewer in a three-quarter pose. Searching hatched thin lines form the nose and eyebrows. The irises themselves are somewhat rapid and angularly formed dots. The only cross-hatching in the drawing is limited to a small area of shading describing the king's cheekbones. In contrast, the lips are formed into an elegant cupid's bow and the moustache is delineated in an equally calligraphic flourish. The hair swirls in more angular waves, echoing the formation of lines in the garments below.<sup>375</sup> The elbow projects and the forearm seems to curve away again and end in a glyph terminating in the back of the hand. In contrast to what was typical of Van Dyck, Lievens does not emphasize the hand, even though the King elegantly gestures toward the collar. An undulating line underneath indicates the thumb.

---

<sup>374</sup> A black chalk drawing of the King purportedly by Lievens (see Sum. 1596x-1615x), was mentioned in the J. Van der Marck sale of 1773 (Sch. Z53), but is now lost. Schneider, 195. It last appeared in a sale in Amsterdam of March 11, 1776, as lot Nr. 797.

<sup>375</sup> Although several fine lines in the bottom right side, such as the right-most mark, seem to be reinforced by heavier ones, in fact these have moved through wet ink, indicating that the drawing was made in a single sitting.

Lievens rarely used pen and ink in his later portraits. These tend to be executed in black chalk, a touch of which is found in this drawing, incidentally, in the shading below the chin. As Sumowski noted, the style of the drawing is quite similar to Lievens's Antwerp-period pen drawings, especially *Half-length Portrait of a Woman* (Sum. D 1641x, c. 1635, formerly London), especially in the range and types of lines and cursory rendering of the hand.<sup>376</sup> The sensitive use of long and graceful, yet halting outlines of an even thickness occurs already in early pen drawings by Lievens such as the *Stoning of St. Paul at Lystra* (Sum 1622x, London) and *Mucius Scaevola and Porsenna* (Sum 1623x, c. 1625, Leiden, fig. 23), and such later works as the *River God* (Sum 1633x, c. 1635-43, Washington D.C., fig. 85). In the Turin drawing it occurs most strikingly in the area of the blouse. It is reasonable to assume that Lievens was attempting to render the king's costume using the most virtuoso manner he could summon and sought to closely imitate Van Dyck's manner. Lievens also pays close attention to surface effects.<sup>377</sup> The dynamic surface pattern of long lines in the bottom half of the Turin drawing resembles lines in Lievens's c. 1630 *tronie* drawing of an old man (Sch/Ekk. SZ LXXII, The Hague). A comparison to a drawing by Rembrandt of the same model in the same pose (Benesch 38, Stockholm) shows Lievens's pronounced tendency to compose on the surface in comparison to Rembrandt's manner of sculpting in more three-dimensional forms.<sup>378</sup> The nervous pose, sensitive execution and the palpably direct interaction with

---

<sup>376</sup> Sumowski, *Drawings* VII, 3898.

<sup>377</sup> Jan Cossiers name has been suggested as the author of the drawing in the past. However, this attention to surface and the close imitation of Van Dyck's elegant and energetic style of drawing also distinguishes this drawing from Cossiers's more fastidious and suggestive draughtsmanship, Cf. Jan Cossiers, *Drawing of a Man*, National Gallery of Scotland, Inv.1660. *Catalogue of Netherlandish Drawings* (Edinburgh: The National Gallery of Scotland, 1985), 19, ill. 127.

<sup>378</sup> *Jan Lievens 1607-1674, Prints & Drawings*, 36, 37.

the artist furthermore indicate that the drawing was made from life. It could well have served as the the model or sketch for the Lievens painting Van der Doort specified was done from life (“had sit in tu liffens”).<sup>379</sup>

While the range of line and sensitivity and speed indicate that not only the face, but also the clothing of the King was drawn from life, other details suggest that Lievens may have added the clothes at a later point. The three attempts to draw the collar to the left and the vague neckline seem to affirm that these were done later or initially noted as a cipher rather than done in the presence of the King with whom time was restricted. The outlines of the face and hair show the kind of dynamic modulation of line expected of a life drawing, whereas the lines of the garments appear more elegant and less sculptural.

Lievens’s characterization of the King illustrates what Huygens noted about Lievens concerning his own portrait (Sum. 1286, 1628-29, on loan to Amsterdam, fig. 20), that Lievens was perceptive and aggrandizing, but not to the point of flattering or idealizing his subject. Lievens carefully delineates the fatigued eyes of the King, for instance, which appear smoothed out in Van Dyck’s later painting, *Triple Portrait of Charles I* (1635-36, Royal Collection).<sup>380</sup> Just as Lievens captured Huygens’s worried expression, so he captures the King’s guarded defensive posture in this drawing.

The fact that Lievens was given a sitting by Charles I indicates that the King took him seriously as a portraitist. If Lievens did, in fact, paint only a few portraits independently in England, one would surmise that these would appear at the end of his

---

<sup>379</sup> Van der Doort in Millar, “Abraham Van der Doort’s Catalogue,” 146, 161.

<sup>380</sup> Sumowski, *Drawings* 7, 3898. Sumowski based his identification of the subject on Van Dyck’s panel showing the king in three poses (made for Bernini, Royal Collection).

stay, which is also when Van Dyck had left, which suggests a date for the drawing around 1634 or 1635. In the Turin drawing the king's pose is direct and elegant but the image, executed with great efficiency and ability, may not have been flattering enough. The King seems distinctly self-conscious and aloof in this drawing and far from a powerful personality, not unlike Huygens in Lievens portrait of him. While Huygens may have appreciated the candor and directness of Lievens's work, Charles, to whom paintings projected an altogether different kind of authority, may not have found it desirable enough to retain Lievens's painting. He soon exchanged it for the Wilton diptych and the double portrait of Prince Charles and Princess Mary.<sup>381</sup>

### **The Düsseldorf portrait drawings of English Courtiers**

A group of three black chalk portrait drawings in Düsseldorf by Lievens seem to portray members of the court of Charles I (Sum. 1645x, 1646x, 1647x) by their elaborate and similar costume (which Sumowski dates from 1630-35). They are among Lievens's most dazzling and direct images: black chalk portraits of varying lengths of young men posing in startlingly familiar and informal ways. Lievens in turn captures the poses with dashing grace, verve and assured precision. Like the drawing of Charles I, they suggest that Lievens felt self-confident in the presence of these subjects.

Werner Sumowski attributed the three Düsseldorf drawings, and a similar one formerly in London, to Lievens, but inexplicably dated them variously to both the

---

<sup>381</sup> Van der Doort in Millar, "Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue," 146, 161. Francis Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," *The Late King's Goods*, Arthur MacGregor, ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1989), 224.

English and Antwerp periods. He correctly dated the costume, common to all the sitters, to the first half of the decade, and moreover the style and function of all four drawings is remarkably consistent one with the other. One of them, *Man with a Cane, facing left* (Sum. 1649x, c. 1635, formerly in London, fig. 89), is additionally inscribed with Lievens's name ("Mister J. Lievense"). The drawings are also remarkably continuous with Lievens's earliest Antwerp portrait drawings, such as *Adriaen Brouwer* (Sum. D 1594, c.1635-7, Paris, fig. 136).

None of the four sitters has been identified, but the drawings nevertheless suggest that a number of English courtiers stood for full-length portrait sketches for paintings, a kind of Van Dyckian portrait that Lievens seems not to have executed in Antwerp or Leiden. The drawings relate closely to Van Dyck's own English portrait sketches in black chalk, such as that of *James Stuart, 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Lennox and First Duke of Richmond* (c. 1635, British Museum, fig. 90), especially in the directness and familiarity of pose and speed of execution that they show.<sup>382</sup> The figures' informality is equally startling, and indicates the ease with which Lievens dealt with prominent clients. The four drawings by Lievens are further evidence of his familiarity, if not absorption, with a broad range of Van Dyck's portrait drawings, beyond the oil sketches for the *Iconographia*.

The Düsseldorf drawings share with Lievens's portrait of Charles I a directness rarely if ever seen in Lievens's many later portrait drawings (perhaps with the exception of Sum. D 1608 in Hamburg). While the flattering softness of the drawings may partly

---

<sup>382</sup> British Museum 1874-8-8-142, reproduced in Lindsay Stainton and Christopher White, *Drawing in England from Hilliard to Hogarth*, exh. cat., (London: British Museum, 1987), 86, 88. *Anthony van Dyck*, Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., ed., exh. cat., 259.

be attributed to condition, the sitters project a sense of seductive ease and hauteur characteristic of the Cavalier court of Charles I. They almost seem to be a reaction to the excessive candor Lievens showed in the Turin drawing of the King, and a decisive move towards the gracefulness and flattery of Van Dyck's portraiture, and were likely done near the end of his London stay. These drawings may even include some of the "great lords" Lievens mentioned to Orlers.<sup>383</sup>

The format of the drawings indicates that they were studies for full-length paintings rather than prints since they correspond to Van Dyck's preparatory drawings for such paintings.<sup>384</sup> A new stylistic element is visible in Lievens's drawings, seen in the areas of sash and lace in *An Aristocratic Youth in Half-length* (Sum. D. 1646, Düsseldorf, fig. 87), which are energetically described in a darting, sharply shifting line that often forms a dazzling jagged, almost fractal pattern. This surface effect replaces the kind of undulating, flowing line typically seen in late Leiden-period drawings such as in the beard of *Bearded Old Man with a Book* (Sum. D 1643x, Darmstadt). The strong shift in his style suggests a comprehensive familiarity with Van Dyck's drawings.

The rows of ribbons at the bottom of the doublet that Lievens described with such finesse seem to be a peculiarly English fashion of c.1625-35.<sup>385</sup> The most conspicuous example of such ribbons is on the doublet worn by Endymion Porter in Van Dyck's double portrait with himself (c. 1635, Madrid). The King also wears such ribbons in Van

---

<sup>383</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

<sup>384</sup> Cf. Anthony van Dyck, *James Stuart, Duke of Richmond and Lennox*, drawing, British Museum, c. 1633, and Van Dyck's portrait painting *James Stuart* of 1635 in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

<sup>385</sup> Emilie E. S. Gordenker, *Anthony Van Dyck (1599-1641) and the Representation of Dress in Seventeenth-Century Portraiture* (Brussels: Brepols, 2001), 34. Gordenker discusses the ribbons below the doublet in Mijten's 1631 full-length *Charles I* in the National Portrait Gallery in London.



Dyck's monumental family portrait, the "*Great Peece*" (1632, Royal Collection), and in the bust-length double portrait with the Queen (1634, Royal Collection). This detail of costume was also worn outside the Royal household, for instance by Charles, the eldest son of the Earl of Pembroke, in Van Dyck's monumental portrait of that family of c.1633-34 (Wilton House). Since no examples of these ribbons occur in Van Dyck's English portraits after 1635, this feature seems to be unique to English court costume of the period.

### **The Drawings of London and Westminster**

Only recently have the sites in two signed landscape drawings by Lievens (Sch. Z 166, location unknown and Sch. Z 176, Frankfurt) been identified as London and Westminster, making them his earliest landscape drawings.<sup>386</sup> Were it not for the signature and a few distinctive touches, *Westminster from across the Thames* (Sch. Z 166, c. 1633/4, location unknown, fig. 91) could be mistaken for a Van Dyck as it resembles *A View of Rye from the north east* (1633, New York, fig. 93) and his *View of Antwerp*

---

<sup>386</sup> Sothebys London, June 30, 2005, lot 228. Stainton and White, 25. Martin Royalton-Kisch suggested that they were later drawings made by Jan Andrea Lievens, based on the lack of crosses on the gables of Westminster Abbey in the Frankfurt drawing, since Wenceslas Hollar's view of 1647 shows them. Writing elsewhere, however, he acknowledged that Hollar on occasion copied earlier drawings by Van Dyck, a notable example being *View of Rye from the north east*. Martin Royalton-Kisch, *The Light of Nature: Landscape drawings and watercolours by Van Dyck and his contemporaries*, exh. cat. (London: British Museum, 1999), 86. Royalton-Kisch cites Sumowski's view that Lievens's landscape drawings cannot be dated to the 1630s, but rather to the 1660s. There is no evidence that Jan Andrea was ever in London or that he would have been inclined to use such an outdated compositional style even if he had. His few landscape drawings show a flat, repetitive kind of foliage, lacking the confidence and responsiveness of his father's works. Martin Royalton Kisch, rev. *Rembrandt et son École. Dessins de la collection Fritz Lugt*. exh. cat. (Paris: Institut Néerlandais, 1997) in *Burlington Magazine* 140 (1998): 621.

(1632, Brussels, fig. 94).<sup>387</sup> In the panoramic *Westminster from across the Thames*, the city spreads across the center of the page, anchored by Westminster Abbey which looms to the right, and tapers off around a bend in the river to the left. Lievens's persistent interest in chiaroscuro manifests itself in his representation of the city in the strong low light of late afternoon.

On the rocky riverbank in the right foreground a few shrubs and plants spring up, the only signs of natural growth and the only details, rendered with a bravura that anticipate his energetic landscapes of the 1660s. One shrub at the center balances the looming mass of Westminster Abbey, which dominates the skyline on the opposite bank of the river. This building, seen from a position slightly to the right, is the subject of the similar pen and wash drawing *Westminster Abbey from the north west* (Sch. Z 167, 1633/4, Frankfurt, fig. 92). Here the majestic building is offset by a more extensive landscape rendered with a bolder application of ink and wash. The drawings share a dramatic sense of depth and the bold angled penstrokes that are so distinctive in his later landscape drawings.<sup>388</sup> The quickly and confidently drawn loops of foliage on the shrub in the center are comparable to the foliage of the central tree in the much later *Peasant dwelling with Hay Stack* (Sum. D 1686x, c. 1660, Toronto, fig. 95). Lievens's atmospheric use of wash in *Westminster from across the Thames* also seems to derive from Van Dyck's developing interest in watercolor at this time.

---

<sup>387</sup> Van Dyck's four views of Rye do not employ wash or watercolor. Martin Royalton-Kisch, *The Light of Nature*, 86.

<sup>388</sup> Nothing comparable from Lievens's Antwerp period survives, but the influence of Van Dyck on Lievens's landscape drawings was persistent. See, for example, the almost grid-like composition of Van Dyck's *A View of St. Mary's, Rye* (1634, Florence), which influenced Lievens's works of the 1660s such as *View of Cleves* (Sum. D 1713, c. 1664, Amsterdam). Royalton-Kisch, *The Light of Nature*, 88.

Lievens thus probably turned to landscape out of admiration for Van Dyck. He made the drawings at the same time he started adding landscape backgrounds to his portraits, for example that of Jacques Gaultier. Lievens may also have been motivated to depict landscape by Van Dyck's practice of including landscape as an integral part of portraiture and history painting.

### **The fate of the English period works**

Lievens's paintings in the Royal Collection were dispersed with the rest of the collections of Charles I. The portrait of the children of Charles I (Sch. 298, lost) was sold on October 23, 1651 to a Captain Stone for four pounds, while no trace remains of the portrait of Charles I traded to Lady Jening.<sup>389</sup> Lievens's Leiden-era *Student reading by a Turf Fire* (Sch. 116, c. 1628, lost) went to Parliament's Surveyor-General Colonel William Webb for five pounds in the October 30, 1649 sale of the King's goods, only slightly more than the four pounds at which the Windsor Castle *Head of an Old Woman* by Lievens was offered (Sum. 2360, c. 1631, fig. 40).<sup>390</sup> Webb, who directed the sale of Crown lands, had also purchased paintings by Titian and Van Dyck at the sale. The plates for the two portrait prints that Lievens created in England went with him to Antwerp, where Lucas Vorsterman published them, as he had the print of Lanier.

---

<sup>389</sup> Schneider, 161.

<sup>390</sup> Schneider, 120.

## Conclusion

Lievens's concentration on portraits and landscape drawings in England showed how strongly Van Dyck influenced him. Although there is no documentary evidence placing Lievens in Van Dyck's workshop, the circumstantial evidence is preponderant: the lack of activity for an industrious painter, the complete absorption of Van Dyck's style and method, from portrait prints to landscapes and landscape backgrounds, and the familiarity through portraiture with sitters ranging from court musicians and porters to the King and the King's family. All these factors point to Lievens having been an assistant to Van Dyck in London. Perhaps he even remained in the workshop during Van Dyck's absence.

Lievens's two prints also give hints of his shift in style towards the work of Van Dyck, while the three portraits show that he successfully gained Royal favor, as well as the acquaintance of court musicians. A series of free and direct full-length portrait drawings of courtiers reinforce the sense of courtly favor and entrance. The drawing of the King remains a virtuoso display of Lievens's draftsmanship, but his perceptive observation of the King's melancholic temperament was far less flattering than the portraits by Van Dyck and may not have appealed to the King, possibly hampering Lievens's long-term prospects in London. Van Dyck had departed London for Flanders in the winter of 1634, shortly after the death of the Infanta Isabella, and returned to London in the spring of 1635, around the time that Lievens left for Antwerp, roughly in time for the entry of Archduke Ferdinand into Antwerp on April 17 of that year. Once in Antwerp, Lievens continued to focus on portraiture in the manner of Van Dyck. Van Dyck's portraits, history paintings and landscapes would continue to exert a powerful

influence on Lievens's work for the rest of his career.

### Chapter 3: Antwerp Period, 1635-1644

Lievens left England for Antwerp in 1635 as an experienced and well-connected court artist. He arrived in Antwerp during the year of the triumphal entry celebrations for Archduke Ferdinand, but was not involved in the production of its various gates and floats that Rubens had designed. Rather Lievens's move was more likely inspired by Anthony van Dyck, who had moved from London to Antwerp in 1633. Whether he was primarily driven by the same spirit of adventure that lured him to England years before - the desire to see "a new country and its opportunity" or by the hope that he might work for Ferdinand's court is not known. In any event, Antwerp was full of Rubens's art in churches and homes, and for that reason alone the city would have held great appeal for Lievens.

Lievens had good reason to hope for commissions for the kind of important works that were the goal of his training and ambition. The year that he moved, 1635, was the year Rubens would leave Antwerp and settle in his newly acquired manor house, *Het Steen* in Elewijt. Van Dyck left Antwerp in the spring of 1635 to return to London, and probably missed seeing Lievens. Lievens traveled to Antwerp by way of Calais, perhaps to bypass plague-ridden Leiden or simply for political expediency. By 1638, Lievens had married and enjoyed artistic success in the form of commissions and history paintings of ever increasing ambition, scale and prestige. Nevertheless his roving, adventurous, and increasingly itinerant spirit led him back to Leiden by the end of the decade. He was no doubt induced to visit Holland in 1639 by Huygens, with whom he had maintained contact in London and Antwerp, as well as to fulfill a prestigious

commission in Leiden. His stay in Leiden, however, appears to have been short-lived for he was soon back in Antwerp by early June 1640 where he remained until 1644.<sup>391</sup>

In the nine years Lievens spent in Antwerp, he made considerable strides towards being the kind of universal artist he set out to be under Lastman. As Orlers recounted in 1641:

“In Engelandt ontrent drie Jaeren geweest zijnde is wederomme te rugge ghecomen op Cales ende van daer op Antwerpen, daer hy hem nedergeset heeft, ende aldaer so inne de Jesuiten kercke, ende voor andere particuliere Personen, veele ende verscheyden uytnemende stucken gemaect, daer over the Const-verstandigen haer ten hoochsten zijn verwonderende. Hy heeft tot Antwerpen getrouwt de Dochter van Michiel Colijns, wesende een uytnemende ende konstich Beeldsnijder ende Steenhouwer. Inden Jaere 1640. heeft hy voor zijn Hoocheyt den Prince van Orangien, ende voor de Burgermeesteren der Stadt Leyden, gemaect twee extraordinare schoone stucken Schilderye, waer van ick van het laetste, hier voor in mijne beschrijvinge vermeld hebbe, uyt alle het geene ick tot hier toe int gros gheseyt hebbe van onsen Leytschen Mr. Ian Lievensz. kan een yder verstant van de Konst hebbende oordeelen, dat van hem metter tijt noch vele Konstighe gemaect zullen werden.”<sup>392</sup>

(“After he had spent some three years in England he returned to Calais and thence to Antwerp, where he settled. He painted several excellent pieces for the Jesuit church and other private persons there, works which were greatly admired by connoisseurs. In Antwerp he married the daughter of Michiel Colijns, an excellent and skilled sculptor and stone-dresser. In 1640, for his Highness the Prince of Orange and for the burgomaster of the city of Leiden, he painted two pieces of exceptional quality, the latter of which I have already mentioned in my

---

<sup>391</sup> Lievens communicated news of Rubens’s death to Constantijn Huygens through David de Wilhelm in Antwerp, who wrote to Huygens on June 6, 1640. Schneider, 292. Lievens’s *Scipio* was transported to Leiden from Antwerp. Frans van Mieris and Daniel van Alphen, *Beschryvinge der Stadt Leyden II* (1670), 375, in Schneider, 118.

<sup>392</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*, 137.

description.<sup>393</sup> From my approximate account of Master Jan Lievens of our city of Leiden, anyone with an understanding of art can expect him to paint many more fine pictures.”<sup>394</sup>

In Antwerp, Lievens completed large-scale history paintings, monumental religious works, genre paintings, landscape paintings, as well as portraits. He converted to Catholicism, possibly by 1635 and certainly before his 1638 marriage to Susanna Colijns de Nole, daughter of the most successful sculptor in the city. In his work he responded to the art of Peter Paul Rubens, Anthony van Dyck and Adriaen Brouwer, and collaborated with David Teniers II (1610-1690) and Jan van der Hecke (1619/20-1684). While there were no signs of success at court, Lievens nevertheless immersed himself in the full range of the thriving art world of Antwerp and continued to adapt and alter his style, suiting his circumstances with an acuity comparable to his years in Leiden. In the absence of Rubens and Van Dyck, Lievens would have competed chiefly against Jacob Jordaens (1593-1578) in Antwerp. Jordaens’s works would also find reflection in Lievens’s own.

The most significant shift in Lievens’s style in Antwerp is away from the simplicity, realism and dramatic light of his Leiden work towards a monumental, stylized and eclectic classicism that reflects the influence of Rubens. This change is clearly visible when comparing his Leiden-period figure of *Bathsheba* (Sum. 1189, c. 1631, Studio City, CA, fig. 27) with that of the Virgin in the *Visitation* (Sum. 1196, c. 1628, Paris, fig. 100).

---

<sup>393</sup> Sch.106, c.1639, lost.

<sup>394</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 139.



The commission for the *Continnence of Scipio*, issued by both the city of Leiden and the Stadhouder Frederik Hendrik in 1639, seems to have been part of an effort to attract Lievens back to Leiden.<sup>395</sup> Lievens did not stay but returned to Antwerp, however, perhaps hoping to benefit from the artistic situation after the deaths of Rubens and Van Dyck, until 1644 when he moved north permanently. There he found a steady flow of the kind of patronage for monumental history painting consistent with his ambitions.

This chapter will discuss the period from 1635 to 1644 when Lievens lived in Antwerp and will begin with a survey of his history paintings, from the 1635 *Sacrifice of Isaac* through the c. 1638 *Visitation*, his mature masterpiece. It will also discuss works related to and following his c. 1639 *Continnence of Scipio* for Leiden's Town Hall and his renewed contact with the court in Holland at that time. These history paintings mark the fulfillment of many of Lievens's ambitions and his successes in Antwerp, but also show that he continued to adapt, develop and refine his style beyond the influence of Rubens and Van Dyck. This adaptation to Flemish art is also apparent in his genre works, portraits and landscapes as well as his woodcut prints, which reveal his active artistic dialogue with the broad community in Antwerp. Finally, this chapter will periodically indicate the factors that led to his return to Holland.

### **Lievens in the Brouwer circle**

---

<sup>395</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

Though Lievens had worked closely with Van Dyck in London, he departed for Antwerp around the time of Van Dyck's return to London. Lievens seems to have quickly joined up with Adriaen Brouwer and Jan Davidsz de Heem, two artists who had lived in Holland for extended periods of time. All three artists appear together in Brouwer's *The Smokers* (c. 1635, New York, fig. 137) along with two others to embodying the five senses.<sup>396</sup> Brouwer hoists the flagon and beside him De Heem fills his pipe. The man blowing smoke behind Brouwer seems to be Joos van Craesbeeck, while the crouching figure to the far left is Jan Lievens bending his nose, embodying the sense of smell (fig. 138).<sup>397</sup> Despite the distorted nose and closed left eye, the shape of the right eye and contour of the mouth and face are so close to those in Van Dyck's portrait of Lievens that Brouwer may even have been satirizing the print directly, with Lievens actively participating in the parody. Brouwer was perhaps making light of these artists' place among the illustrious men in Van Dyck's' project as a whole.<sup>398</sup>

---

<sup>396</sup> The biographer Jacob Campo Weyermann (1677-1747), in his 1729 *Levens-beschrijvinghen*, called this painting a "history piece" because most of the faces in it were not anonymous but portraits. Adriaen Brouwer, Jan Cossiers (1600-1671) and Jan Davidsz De Heem were present, according to Carel de Moor (1656-1738) who claimed to have his information from Jan Davidsz de Heem himself. E. J. Reynolds, *Some Brouwer Problems* (Lausanne: 1931), 51-53, 63- 66, 85-86. Karolien de Clippel, "Adriaen Brouwer, portrait painter: new identifications and an iconographic novelty," *Oud Holland* 117 (2004), 196, 204. Jean Denucé, *De Antwerpsche Konstkamers* (Antwerp: De Sikkell, 1932), 263. Cossiers worked on the decorations for the entry of Ferdinand and the Torre de la Parada and was thus fully engaged with Rubens's workshop. De Moor is notable for having entirely over-painted Lievens's 1669 *Justice receives the Corpus Juris from Time* but did not necessarily himself know Lievens or Cossiers or what they looked like. Hans Vlieghe, "Jan Cossiers," *Grove Art Online*, Oxford University Press, [www.groveart.com](http://www.groveart.com) (Accessed April 12, 2005).

<sup>397</sup> De Klippel, 196. Walter Liedtke, *Flemish Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1984), 5-7.

<sup>398</sup> Traditionally identified as Jan Cossiers, the figure does not show the shallower features and slightly projecting eyes and broad cheeks or curly hair that appear in Cossiers's *Self-portrait* drawing (Oxford). Liedtke, 281. The figure's hand covers the most distinctive feature of Lievens's face, his chin, which is especially prominent in Van Dyck's portrait. Less convincing is the proposal by De Clippel that Brouwer posed all these people again as *The Vices*, with Lievens replaced by Cossiers as *Invidia*. De Clippel, 204-212.

The bohemian behavior of Lievens in Brouwer's picture is at odds not only with how Van Dyck portrayed him but also with how Huygens described him, "Most amazingly [Rembrandt and Lievens] regard even the most innocent diversion of youth as a waste of time" and later, Orlers, "He applied himself with such industry and diligence to improving his skills that he was oblivious to anything else."<sup>399</sup> The role-playing in the portrait recalls the kind of event and celebrations typical of a Netherlandish painter's group or a meeting of Rhetoricians.<sup>400</sup> Brouwer portrayed the group as they celebrated various personal advancements within the painters' guild from September 1634 to September 1635, when Lievens registered and when Brouwer and De Heem were named to the guild's *Violeren* chamber of rhetoric.<sup>401</sup>

By both his life and work Lievens was connected to each of the other artists in *The Smokers*. De Heem had lived in Leiden from 1625 until the early 1630s, producing vanitas still lifes and genre scenes and possibly collaborated with Lievens in one of Lievens's Leiden-period vanitas still lifes (Sum. 1300, c. 1627, Amsterdam fig. 51). De Heem and Brouwer were the witnesses to the March 1, 1636 contract whereby Lievens

---

<sup>399</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 134. Orlers, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

<sup>400</sup> Brouwer included Craesbeeck and De Heem again in the second group portrait in a tavern (c. 1635-6, Haarlem), but not Lievens. De Clippel, 204. Cf. Gonzales Coques, *Artists' banquet* (Musée du Petit Palais, c. 1660, Paris). F.C. Legrand, *Les Peintres flamands de genre au xviiie siècle* (Brussels: Meddens, 1963), 97, 257-258 n. 180. Brouwer's painting recalls more remotely the Bacchic initiation rites of the *Bentveughels*, the Dutch and Flemish artists's community in Rome shown in Pieter van Laer, *A gathering of Pieter van Laer and his friends* (drawing, Berlin). Thomas Kren, "Chi non vuol Baccho: Roeland van Laer's burlesque painting about Dutch artists in Rome" *Simiolus* 11 (1980): 63-70.

<sup>401</sup> Many painters such as Jan Steen, Rembrandt, and David Teniers II included themselves in their genre paintings in ways that add great immediacy to the work and break the spell of anonymity, but also comment on their own life, although the specificity of Brouwer's image is exceptional. Cf. Rembrandt's *Self-portrait as the Prodigal Son in a tavern* (Bredius 30, c. 1635-36, Dresden). David Teniers portrayed himself in a tavern (Dresden) and several times as an alchemist, most notably in a small panel now in Munich (1680, Pinakothek). De Clippel, 199. Phillip Rombouts and Théodore van Lieris, *De Liggeren en andere historische archieven van de Antwerpsche Sint Lucasgilde* (Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1961), 61, 66.

took on a certain Hans van den Wijngaerde as pupil for six years (otherwise unknown, but his help no doubt facilitated the production of the large-scale works that followed).<sup>402</sup> This contacts was with artists who painted in genres other than religious and mythological works, which were presumably Lievens's prime focus in Antwerp and Leiden. Around 1636 Lievens began painting landscapes in the manner of Brouwer, such as the *Landscape by Moonlight* (Sum. 1304, late 1630s, Berlin, fig. 127).<sup>403</sup> Lastly, Lievens's admiration for Van Craesbeeck is evident in genre paintings of the Antwerp period, such as *Fighting Card Players and Death* (Sum. 1198, 1638, London, fig. 115) and *The Miserly couple and Death* (Sum. 1197, c. 1638, Melbury House, fig. 117).<sup>404</sup> Lievens seems to have plunged into this new artistic and social world with gusto.

### History Paintings

Lievens painted his first large-scale history paintings in Antwerp, and composed these by striving for what Huygens termed the "groots en verheven" (the "lofty"), a goal he soon realized when his monumental painting, *Holy Family surrounded by Heads of Angels* (Sch. 29a, c. 1638, lost) was installed Antwerp's splendid new Jesuit church,

---

<sup>402</sup> Antwerpen Stadsarchief. Notaris G. Ghysbrechts N1824 (MF 832K) March 1, 1636, r 16. Although van den Branden read the names of Jan Davidsz de Heem and Adriaen Brouwer as signatories, while their names only appear in the text as witnesses.

<sup>403</sup> Cf. Adriaen Brouwer, *Dune Landscape in Moonlight* (c. 1625-28, Berlin). Gunter Böhmer, *Adriaen Brouwer als Landschafter* (Munich: Filser, 1940), 44, 45. Jan Lievens, *ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 246. Sabine Jacobs, "Zur Entwicklung der Landschaftsmalerei von Jan Lievens," *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 22.

<sup>404</sup> Schneider, 44, 277. No further trace of Hans van den Wijngaerde survives but he was perhaps related to Pontius's student Frans van den Wijngaerde who engraved and published so many of Lievens's inventions. No trace of this pupil's independent work survives, making it difficult to gauge his contribution to Lievens's production.

surrounded by Rubens's work.<sup>405</sup> While his portraits and genre paintings continue to show the influence of Van Dyck and others, the monumental forms, compositions, and incipient stylistic classicism in such history paintings as the *Sacrifice of Isaac* (Sum. 1194, c. 1635, Rome, fig. 97) and *The Visitation* (Sum. 1196, c. 1638, Paris, fig. 100) reveal Lievens's adaptation to and fascination with the work of Rubens. Just as Lievens tempered his love of Van Dyck's elegance with his own realism and earnest monumentality, in Antwerp he also maintained his own artistic personality; an eclectic fusion of his own somber realism with the monumentality of Rubens and the elegance of Van Dyck.

### ***The Sacrifice of Isaac***

Although he had concentrated on portraiture in London, in Antwerp Lievens resumed history painting and in his first three years there executed a number of important works that show how dramatically his style had changed under Van Dyck. Among them are three paintings derived from the story of the sacrifice of Isaac (Genesis 22). Two of are of considerable size suggesting a commission, although their patron is unknown. The paintings depict the moment when, commanded by God, Abraham prepared to sacrifice his only son and heir Isaac, who had been miraculously conceived in Abraham's old age in the fulfillment of God's promise that the aged patriarch would have innumerable descendants. Abraham ascended Mount Moriah, built the altar, bound Isaac upon it and drew his knife. One of Lievens's compositions shows the sacrifice itself, with Abraham

---

<sup>405</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 129, 132.

about to kill his son Isaac (Sum. 1194, c. 1635, Rome, fig. 97), while the other two show a slightly later moment; the offering of the ram.<sup>406</sup>

The enormous *Sacrifice of Isaac* (250 x 176 cm, fig. 97) shows Abraham plunging his knife towards Isaac on the altar, about to kill him.<sup>407</sup> An angel has interrupted the sacrifice, lightly deflecting the knife with one hand while pointing to heaven with the other, while Abraham and Isaac look upward to God as the source of salvation. The sacrifice of Isaac was a prefiguration of the crucifixion of Christ and an appropriate subject for a large painting in the format of an altarpiece, although again, the commission for the work is not known.

Beside Isaac is an over-sized censer with glowing coals. Lievens placed this in the bottom right-hand corner of his composition, the same place that Lastman placed a metal pail of glowing coals in his *Sacrifice of Isaac* of c. 1612 (Amsterdam, fig. 96). As a contemporary liturgical object, Lievens's censer didactically refers to the function of this large painting as an altarpiece and the mass that would be celebrated in front of it, at which such objects would be used. As such, the censer was likely a detail specified by the unknown patron of the work.

The even larger censer that appears in the *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* (Sum. 1195, c. 1636, Castle Howard, fig. 98) is shown emitting smoke. The small scale

---

<sup>406</sup> A recently discovered copy of the Doria *The Sacrifice of Isaac* is now in the Guttman Collection (c. 1635, New York). Doron J. Lurie, *Jan Lievens: The Sacrifice of Isaac*, exh. cat. (Tel Aviv: Museum of Art, 1998), 31. The Fourchoudt family records list four tronies by Lievens and an "Offerande van Abram na Livens," delivered to Jacobus de Bruyn on March 8, 1654, for 40 guilders, perhaps referring to the Guttman Collection painting. J. Denucé, *Art-Export in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century in Antwerp, The Firm Fourchoudt*, (Antwerp: De Sikkels, 1931), 55, 135, 140, 165, 172. A version by Jan Andrea Lievens was listed in a May 18, 1706 sale in Amsterdam as lot 44, "Abrams Offerhande van Jan Lievensz. de Yonge."

<sup>407</sup> At 250 x 176 cm., its size is close to that of the Louvre *Visitation* (280 x 183 cm). The Guttman copy is nearly identical in size, at 234.3 x 174.3 cm.

of this painting suggests that it served as design for a large finished work, the kind of sketch or study that Lievens made in preparation for several of his other Antwerp-period compositions (for example, the Munich *Pietà*, c. 1639).<sup>408</sup> Lievens converted to Catholicism before 1638, and the addition of the censer shows how thoroughly Lievens adapted to the patronage and iconographical demands in his new religio-political context in the Counter-Reformation bastion of Antwerp. This adaptation helps explain how he was able to obtain the Jesuit commissions he received around 1638.<sup>409</sup>

Lievens must have brought the Castle Howard version with him to Leiden when he visited in 1639. In 1642, Philips Angel praised the composition in his *Lof der Schilderkonst*:

“So yet bysonders, doch natuerlicx heb’ ick bevonden in een graeutje van Jan Lievensz. daer hy de offerhanden des Patriarchs Abraham in affghemaelt hadd’, doch gansch onghemeen, en evenwel eygentlick, volgens de beschryvinghe Iosephi den Ioodschen Hystori Schryver, in ‘t Eerste Boeck op ‘t leste vant 13de Cappittel, alwaar hy seyt, dat, na Godt het voornemen van Abraham ghestudt hadd’, sy malkanderen (als van nieuws ghevonden) omhelsden, en kuste, het welcke dese groote Geest seer aerdich (hoewel rou) uyt gebeelt heeft, latende den Brantoffer smoocken, terwijl sy den ander omvatten. Siet! deze vryheyt is gheoorloft dat yemandt om tot meerder veranderlicke kennise der Hystoien te komen, meer als een Boeck doorlesen mach, het sy een die het breeder beschrijft, of uytleyt, waer van den Schilder door syn goet oordeel dat hy heeft, het eyghenlicxste en seeckerste moet nabootsen, want dat hier Abraham Isaack omhelst heeft is ghelooffelick, schoon de Bybel daer gheen ghewach van en maect, want Isack was Abraham (door het ghebodt Godts) los ghestelt, ende soo hy de begheerte Godts

---

<sup>408</sup> Such sketches survive for the *Pietà* (Charles Roeloffsz, Amsterdam) and *Jacob receives Joseph’s bloody coat* (Sotheby’s London, December 9, 2005, lot 254).

<sup>409</sup> The *Visitation* (Sum. 1196, c. 1639, Louvre) was painted for the Jesuit church in Brussels and the *Holy Family with many Heads of Angels* for the Jesuit church in Antwerp (Sch. 29a, before 1639, lost).

ghehoorsamelick na-quam, ghenoege saem als verlooren, maer hem, die door de ghenoege saem ghehoorsaemheyt, die hy in de ghewillige op-offeringhe syns zoons betoont hadde, wederom hadde, wederom ghegeven zynde, heeft buyten twyffel in dien oude Vaders herte so groote vreughde doen ontstaen, alsser te voren een harde en droeve indruck gheweest is, en syn zoon buyten twyffel in (die hy als van de doot sach weder komen) daerom in syn armen ghenomen, ende aen de borst ghedruckt...<sup>410</sup>

(“I found something similarly special but natural in a small grisaille by Jan Lievens, in which he painted the sacrifice of the patriarch Abraham, which was very unusual yet natural. It accorded with the description given by Josephus, the Jewish historian, at the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> chapter of the first book, where he says that after God had stayed Abraham’s hand they embraced one another (as if they had newly found each other) and kissed. That great mind depicted this very distinctively (albeit roughly), showing the burnt offering smoking while they embraced. You see, this license is justified that one may read more than one book to arrive at a more varied knowledge of the histories. It might be one with a more lengthy description or explanation, the essence or most certain part of which the painter must imitate using his good judgment. For it is believable that Abraham embraced Isaac, even if the Bible does not say so, for Isaac had been torn from him (by God’s command) and, as he obediently honored God’s request, was as good as lost. But after displaying sufficient obedience by freely offering up his son, the latter’s restoration undoubtedly brought as much joy to his old father’s heart as it had previously been troubled and mournful, that there can be no doubt that he took his son in his arms and pressed him to his breast when he saw him return as if from the dead.”)<sup>411</sup>

The small grisaille (“graeutje”) to which Angel refers showed the offering already ignited, and thus corresponds to the painting in Castle Howard, also in the fact that Angel

---

<sup>410</sup> Angel, in Schneider, 295.

<sup>411</sup> Angel, trans Hoyle, *Simiolus* 24 (1996), 246. Angel, 48, in Schneider, 295.



refers to it as “rou” (“rough”). Angel used the example of Lievens’s love of accuracy to encourage painters to consult several sources when inventing historical compositions.<sup>412</sup>

The setting and composition of the small *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* are similar to those of the large *Sacrifice of Isaac* except that Abraham now wears the rich cloak upon which he had laid Isaac on the altar in the earlier work, and that now the father and son embrace each other.<sup>413</sup> One can barely make out the form of the ram in the flames on the altar.<sup>414</sup> Lievens painted a large-scale version of the *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* around 1637 (Sum. 1199, c. 1637, Braunschweig, fig. 99), but omitted the censer seen in the *Sacrifice of Isaac* and the Castle Howard sketch. The large scale of the Braunschweig painting suggests it was a commissioned altarpiece although the subject is otherwise unprecedented on that scale. With the censer missing, the emphasis shifts to the ram as the sacrificial offering. Freshly slain, it has yet to be added to the fire and is explicitly displayed, with the knife, as the substitute offering and symbol of the Eucharist.

The monumentality of the Braunschweig *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* represents a considerable shift from the attenuated and planar composition of the earlier *Sacrifice of Isaac* and the broad landscape of the Castle Howard sketch. Lievens moved away from the dramatic moment, theatrical gestures and psychological isolation of the *Sacrifice* to the more diffuse sense of time and united the embracing father and son, into a

---

<sup>412</sup> Angel, Hoyle, trans., 246.

<sup>413</sup> Abraham bears an uncanny resemblance to Henry IV in Rubens’s *Henry IV presented with the portrait of Marie de Medici* (c. 1622, Paris), painted in Antwerp over a decade earlier.

<sup>414</sup> Rembrandt’s inventory of 1656 includes a Lievens painting of the *Sacrifice of Isaac*, likely the small Castle Howard painting. Strauss and van der Meulen, 361. Philips Angel, *Lof der Schilderkunst*, (Leiden: 1642), in Schneider, 295.

single mass.<sup>415</sup> The shimmering fabrics and loose, flowing brushwork add to the sense of grandeur and emotional sweep of the Braunschweig painting, which represents a singular achievement in Lievens's career. After experimenting with the composition in the Castle Howard sketch, he concentrated on the central group and achieved a monumentality that is also visible in his subsequent masterpiece *The Visitation* (Sum. 1196, c. 1638, Paris) that persists throughout the works of his maturity.

Flavius Josephus (b. AD 37/8-?), a Jewish historian and priest who retired to Rome, wrote *Antiquities of the Jews* (A.D. 93), and described many narratives found in the Bible, but with additional episodes and details. In the text to which Angel refers, Book I, Chapter 13, of the *Antiquities*, Josephus described the aftermath of the sacrifice of Isaac as follows:

“When God had said this, he produced to them a ram, which did not appear before, for the sacrifice. So Abraham and Isaac receiving each other unexpectedly, and having obtained the promises of such great blessings, embraced one another; and when they had sacrificed, they returned to Sarah, and lived happily together, God affording them his assistance in all things they desired.”<sup>416</sup>

Lievens's *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* is not merely an Old Testament history painting embellished with details from a second iconographic source as Angel suggested, but rather illustrates part of the story related in Josephus's text but *not* found in the corresponding Biblical account, which was unusual. Lievens shows not only the embrace

---

<sup>415</sup> Schneider aptly interpreted Lievens's shift in subject from the *Sacrifice* to the *Thank-offering* as a shift in meaning from the ecstasy of salvation to the sweetness of the embrace of the thank-offering. Schneider, 151.

<sup>416</sup> Josephus, *The Works of Josephus*, trans William Whiston. The first translation of Josephus into Dutch, published by Nicolaes van Winghe and translated by Jaspar Troyens, appeared in Antwerp in 1580. The first translation published in Holland appeared in Amsterdam in 1602, followed by an edition in Leiden (J. Paedts zoon) in 1607.

of father and son, but as they look to heaven the angel calls a second time renewing the covenant promise to Abraham: “because you have done this thing, and have not withheld your son, your only son, indeed I will greatly bless you, and I will greatly multiply your seed...” (Genesis 22: 16,17).<sup>417</sup> By using Josephus, Lievens took an active role in interpreting the subject matter in an innovative way, as Angel noted, and thus demonstrated an ambitious spirit as a history painter.

Lievens is not documented as converting to Catholicism before his 1638 marriage to Susannah Colijns de Nole in the Catholic St. Jacob’s church, yet the ritualism, typological theology, and eucharistic character of Lievens’s 1635 *Sacrifice of Isaac* and the 1636 and 1637 paintings of *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram*, and the fact that they took the format of ecclesiastical commissions, indicate that Lievens worked for the Catholic church and may have already converted to Catholicism shortly after his arrival in Antwerp in 1635. The conversion demonstrates the extent to which Lievens assimilated, in his life and work, the culture Counter-Reformation Flanders. Such a conversion would in any case likely have been a prerequisite to working for the Jesuits and probably also for marrying into a family responsible for producing most of the major sculptural monuments of the Counter-Reformation in and around Antwerp.

---

<sup>417</sup> Until the seventeenth century, the Jewish-Roman wars were typically the only sections from Josephus illustrated in Bibles and manuscripts, as was the case with the German edition of Josephus illustrated by Joost Amman of which Rembrandt, for instance, owned an example in 1656. Franz Landsberger, “Rembrandt and Josephus,” *Art Bulletin* 36 (1953): 62. Rembrandt owned a complete German edition of 1574 illustrated with woodcuts then thought to be by Tobias Stimmer, now attributed to Joost Amman. *The Illustrated Bartsch* 20, 12 (New York: Abaris, 1979), 379. Rembrandt’s 1656 inventory also listed a version of *The Sacrifice of Abraham* by Lievens, most likely the Castle Howard sketch. Strauss and van der Meulen, 361. Cf. Jean Fouquet, *Les Antiquités Judaïques*, c. 1470-1476, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Fr. 247, Paris.

## Work for the Jesuits

### *Visitation*

In December 1638, Lievens married Susannah, the daughter of Andries Colijns de Nole, of the family of sculptors who dominated the Antwerp market at the time. One of Lievens's first documented commissioned works in Antwerp, a *Holy Family with many Heads of Angels* (Sch. 29a, before 1639, lost), was for the chapel of the Virgin in the Jesuit church that his father-in-law Andries had helped decorate.<sup>418</sup> Another painting, the majestic *Visitation* (Sum. 1196, c. 1638, Paris, fig. 100), was for the Brussels Jesuit church. Because of their importance, Andries Colijns de Nole must have helped his future son-in-law acquire these commissions.<sup>419</sup>

In the *Visitation*, Joseph and Mary arrive at the house of Elizabeth and the priest Zacharias. The angel Gabriel just revealed to Mary that both she and her elderly, barren cousin Elisabeth were miraculously pregnant. Mary embraces Elisabeth at the center, who, lost in wonder, stares past her with lips slightly parted. By setting the encounter out-of-doors and showing Elizabeth as silent, Lievens has taken liberties with the Biblical text, which states,

“Now at this time Mary arose and went in a hurry to the hill country, to a city of Judah, and entered the house of Zacharias and greeted Elizabeth. When Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, the baby leaped in her womb; and

---

<sup>418</sup> Vlieghe, 233, 234.

<sup>419</sup> The two paintings remained in their respective churches until the sales of Jesuit goods from churches and colleges in 1777. Each was nearly three metres tall. The *Visitation* was known since Descamps's 1769 account, to have been installed on the altar of the Sodality of Counselors in the Jesuit church in Brussels.<sup>419</sup> The Government of Maria-Theresa ordered the suppression of the Jesuit order on September 13, 1773. M. Ch. Piot, “Les Tableaux des collèges des Jésuites supprimés en Belgique,” *Bulletins de l'Academie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique* 57 (1878), 141.

Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. And she cried out with a loud voice and said ‘Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! And how has it happened to me, that the mother of my Lord would come to me! For behold, when the sound of your greeting reached my ears, the baby leaped in my womb for joy.’”(Luke 1: 41-43)

The moment of double revelation is rendered by Lievens in a monumental manner, the characters filled with a tender sentiment that recalls the *Abraham and Isaac sacrificing the Ram* in Braunschweig (Su.m. 1199, c. 1627, fig. 99)

Lievens’s *Visitation* does not follow or imitate Rubens’s earlier *Visitation* on the wing of the prominent altarpiece, the *Descent from the Cross* (1612-14, Antwerp, fig. 101, fig. 101). Rubens showed Mary and Elisabeth still moving towards each other as they stand on a bridge amid random street traffic. In that painting, Elizabeth touches Mary’s abdomen, reinforcing visually the words she says as they meet. In contrast, by having them embrace and by composing them as a single unified mass at the center of the painting, Lievens emphasized how the encounter unified Mary and Elisabeth. The presence of their smiling husbands heightens the sense of warmth and unity.

The faces of Zacharias, Elizabeth and Joseph are familiar from Lievens’s stock of *tronies* and genre types, but he has given these types added emotion. Lievens’s Mary is an ideal type with features reminiscent from such examples in Rubens’s work as the figures of the Virgin in the 1621 *Adoration of the Shepherds* (Rouen), *Virgin and Child with Sts. Anne and John the Baptist* (c. 1621, Madrid) and the print *Madonna and Child* engraved by Schelte a Bolswert (Holl. III, 196, c. 1628-35). Lievens included a similar Virgin in his devotional print *The Virgin presents a Pear to the Child* (Holl. 8, c. 1639,

fig. 103), the kind of devotional catholic image that testifies to Lievens's dynamic adaptation to Antwerp's artistic and religious environment.

### **The Problem of the *Holy Family* in Antwerp**

Until recently, Cornelis Schut's *Holy Family with Saint Anne and Saint John the Baptist* (Sum. 1204, c. 1635-40, Antwerp) in the Chapel of the Virgin in the Jesuit Church in Antwerp was thought to be identical with Lievens's c. 1638 *Holy Family with many Heads of Angels* (Sch. 29a, c. 1638, lost) originally installed in that location.<sup>420</sup>

---

<sup>420</sup> Gertrude Wilmers has convincingly attributed the painting currently installed, *Holy Family with St. Anne and St. John the Baptist*, to the workshop of Cornelis Schut (1597-1655), a Rubens and Jordaens follower, and dated it to the second half of the 1630s. By then Schut had already completed a pair of panels in the Jesuit church, a *St. Francis Xavier extending the Host* and *St. Francis Xavier preaching in Asia*. Gertrude Wilmers, *Cornelis Schut. A Flemish Painter of the High Baroque*. (Brussels: Brepols, 1996), Nrs. 75, 76, A13, A14. The *Holy Family with St. Anne and St. John the Baptist* shows the Virgin enthroned with the child on her lap and John the Baptist standing before them with a shepherd's crook and holding a banderole. To Mary's right is an elderly Joseph, gesturing to the viewer, and St. Anne is to her left. Overhead, cherubs play with the tools of the passion. Jacob de Wit (1695-1755) identified Lievens's painting in his *Kerken van Antwerpen* (completed 1748, first published 1774) and this identification was maintained by J. B. Descamps, who located Lievens's painting next to the door, where Schut's painting is currently installed (1769). The most persuasive support for Wilmer's reattribution of the Antwerp canvas lies in its similarity to the *Virgin and Child with Sts. Anne and John the Baptist* in the Church of our Lady in Temse (Canvas 167 x 230 cm, 1644) and another in the Église St.-Nicolas in Enghein (Canvas 160 x 203 cm). A preparatory drawing for the Enghein canvas is in the Museum Stedelijk Prentenkabinet in Antwerp, (photo KIK-IRPA B85851), [www.kikirpa.be](http://www.kikirpa.be) (Accessed August 22, 2005). While the figure of the child Baptist in the Antwerp painting may superficially suggest a relationship to that of Isaac in Lievens's *Sacrifice of Isaac* (Sum. 1194, 1635, Rome), the figure style is dramatically different; the broadly blocked-out features are much more expressive and dramatic than any by Lievens, and nearly identical in style and pose to the angel to the right in the Temse *Virgin and Child with Sts. Anne and John the Baptist* by Schut. The figure of the elderly Joseph to the left in the Antwerp canvas is remote from any of Lievens's many tronies of old men. The lighting, moreover, adds drama rather than reinforcing the character of the figure that Lievens used. Its composition is organized by a pattern of angled joints and poses in the figures to create a swirling pattern unlike the solemn monumentality of Lievens's other compositions, such as the Louvre *Visitation* and *Jacob receives Joseph's bloody coat* (Sum 1203, 1639-40, Aix-en-Provence). The dais-like stepped podium recurs in the Enghein canvas by Schut, another element among many that would be highly anomalous for Lievens. For the history of the confusion of the two works, see Wilmers, 91- 92 (A27), 250-251, note 42. Additions to the bottom corners indicate that Schut's painting has been altered to fit the location. Jacobus de Wit, *De kerken van Antwerpen*, (1774, Antwerp: Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1910), 63. Jean-Baptist Descamps, *Voyage Pittoresque de la Flandre et du Brabant, avec des réflexions relativement aux Arts et quelques gravures* (1838, Paris, Ch. Boehn, 1769), 185. F. Joseph van den Branden, *Geschiedenis van de Antwerpsche Schilderschool*, (Antwerp: J.-E. Buschmann, 1883), 864.

Lievens's *Holy Family* was still recorded there by Jacob De Wit in 1748 and Jean-Baptist Descamps in 1769.<sup>421</sup>

The first reference to Lievens's *Holy Family* was by Jan Jansz Orlers in his 1641 *Beschrijvinge der Stadt Leyden*, who reported that in Antwerp Lievens "...made many and various excellent paintings for private persons and the Jesuit Church..." ("...en aldaer inne de Jesuiten kercke, ende voor andere particuliere Personen, veele ende verschyden uytnemende stucken gemaect..."), but did not specify their subjects.

Because Andries Colijns de Nole was working in the Chapel of the Virgin in the Jesuit Church from 1635-38 and because Lievens married his daughter in late 1638, it can be

---

Arnold Houbraken, basing his biography of Lievens largely on Orlers's information, referred to Lievens's clients as including the "kloosterpapen" in Antwerp. Houbraken, in Schneider, 201. Angel, in Schneider, 294, 295. Since Orlers's published his biography in 1641, the painting by Schut in the chapel today was even dated accordingly to "the end of the thirties." Sumowski III, 1785. This is the date Wilmers assigns to the Schut. Wilmers, 92.

<sup>421</sup> Like Lievens's c. 1638 *Visitation*, however, *The Holy Family with many Heads of Angels* was sold in the 1777 dispersal of Jesuit goods following their suppression of the order, and described in the catalogue as "well painted, and with a lively light" (8'6" x 6'). "Catalogue des Tableaux Déposés au Collège d'Anvers," *Catalogue d'une nombreuse et riche collection de Tableaux & Estampes Des Mmeilleurs Maîtres Flamands, Italiens et Autres quie se ventdront publiquement & aux plus offrans, à Bruxelles, à Anvers & à Gand*. May 5, 12, 20, 1777. (Brussels, Lannoy auctioneers: 1777), lot 20. As the only work by Lievens listed among the Antwerp lots sold May 12, this was certainly the one to which Orlers and subsequent authors referred. Lievens's *Visitation* (8' 4.5" x 6' 1"), listed with the Brussels lots sold May 5, had nearly the same dimensions. Schneider incorrectly lists Lievens's original painting, as selling on May 20, and measuring 104 cm. high. The painting actually sold on May 12 and the catalogue lists it as measuring 279 cm. high by 195 cm. wide. Schneider, 100. It was therefore comparable in size to Schut's work (c. 210 cm wide, not c. 315 cm as listed by Schneider). Schneider, 99-100. Royal Institute for the Study and Conservation of Belgium's Cultural Heritage, [www.kikirpa.be](http://www.kikirpa.be) (Accessed December 20, 2005). "Jesuites de Brussels, Louvain, Namur, Nivelles, Malines, Alost, Mons," *Catalogue d'une nombreuse et riche collection de Tableaux & Estampes Des Mmeilleurs Maîtres Flamands, Italiens et Autres quie se ventdront publiquement & aux plus offrans, à Bruxelles, à Anvers & à Gand*. May 5, 12, 20, 1777. (Brussels, Lannoy auctioneers: 1777), lot 6. In attributing the now-lost painting to Lievens, De Wit was correcting the attribution to Gerard Seghers. He claimed that his judgment was supported by "all the connoisseurs of art" and was based on the resemblance of the picture's style to that of Van Dyck and on its Italianate style, which certainly does not rule out Schut. Though his *Kercken van Antwerpen* was published in 1774 De Wit finished the manuscript by 1748, likely well before the arrival of Descamps, who published his journeys in 1769. Gerard Segher's *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist* (Vienna), reflects the influence of Titian and Rubens, whereas De Wit was aware that Lievens's style was closer to Van Dyck's. Schut traveled to Rome from 1624-27 and Florence 1628. De Wit, 63, 64. De Wit knew the Jesuit church well, as he had copied Rubens's ceiling panels before they were destroyed in the fire of 1718 that spared the adjacent Chapel of the Virgin. De Wit, vii. Since the painting was removed in 1777, the error lies with Van den Branden.

postulated that De Nole likely assisted Lievens in obtaining this, his first documented large-scale public commission.<sup>422</sup> Its appearance was not reproduced or fully described, but Lievens's small devotional print of c. 1637, *Virgin giving a pear to the Christ Child* (Holl. 8, fig. 103), in which the interaction between Mary and Jesus, sweet yet restrained, might reflect what the Virgin and Child looked like in the painting. Although the *Holy Family* was not conceived as an altarpiece like the *Visitation*, it was nevertheless a Catholic subject painted for Jesuits, the order most closely tied to the Counter-Reformation, and Lievens painted it around the time that he married in a Catholic church. The commission of these two monumental works for major churches in Brussels and Antwerp marked a major achievement on Lievens's ambitious path to becoming a history painter on par with Rubens and Van Dyck.

### Visit to Leiden in 1639

Around 1639 Lievens obtained a commission for a *Continenence of Scipio* (Sch. 106, 1638-1641, lost, fig. 106) for the *Vroedschapkamer* or council chamber of the Town Hall of Leiden (1635) newly built by Lieven de Key.<sup>423</sup> Orlers, who must have been directly involved with Lievens's commission, documented the role of the Stadhouder (and therefore Constantijn Huygens) in the commissioning of two works from Lievens,

---

<sup>422</sup> Andries Colijns de Nole executed a sculpture of the *Virgin and Child* for the Jesuit church in Antwerp between 1635 and 1638. [www.kikirpa.be](http://www.kikirpa.be) (Accessed July 5, 2005).

<sup>423</sup> It remained there until destroyed in the fire of February 12, 1929. Lievens's presence in Leiden is certified by a document signed there on August 13, 1639. The amount of detail collected by Orlers about Lievens's activities after 1632, such as his English portraits, journey via Calais, etc, further supports Lievens's having made the trip and furnishing the information at that time.



“Inden Jaere 1640. heeft hy voor zijn Hoocheyt den Prince von Orangien, ende voor de Burgermeesteren der Stadt Leyden, gemaect twee extraordinare schoone stucken Schilderye, waer van ick van het laetste, hier voor in mijne beschrijvinge vermeld hebbe...”<sup>424</sup>

(“In the year 1640, he made two extraordinarily beautiful pieces of painting for his highness the Prince of Orange and for the Burgomasters of the city of Leiden, the latter of which I have already mentioned in my description...”)<sup>425</sup>

Orlors only mentions the subject of Lievens’s painting for the Town Hall, but not the subject of his painting for Frederik Hendrik. Although Lievens’s original *Scipio* was lost in the 1929 fire that destroyed the Town Hall, an early twentieth-century copy reveals that Lievens delivered to the city of his birth a work of dignity and splendor in a high international style that he had carefully selected and distilled from the leading painters and works he had encountered in Flanders, with a level of classical severity thus far unknown in his work. Lievens only stayed in Leiden for a short time and was already back in Antwerp by June 1640, from where he shipped the finished work. The city awarded him a gold medal along with his payment in 1641.<sup>426</sup>

## Portraits in Leiden

---

<sup>424</sup> Orlors, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 137.

<sup>425</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>426</sup> The fee of 1500 guilders was paid to Lievens on November 15, 1641. He was awarded a medal of gold worth Dfl. 99 while the transportation from Antwerp to Leiden cost Dfl. 150. The early twentieth-century copy was owned by Mrs. Secretary Dr. A. von Weinberg (née Huygens, intriguingly enough), in Frankfurt. Frans van Mieris and Daniel van Alphen, *Beschrijving der Stad Leyden* II, (Leiden, 1670), 375. Schneider, 118.

While in Leiden, presumably while negotiating the commission for *The Continnence of Scipio*, Lievens portrayed both Constantijn Huygens (Sum. D., 1598, 1639, London, fig. 104) and Daniel Heinsius, who was classics professor and librarian at Leiden University (Holl. 22, fig. 105). A portrait of Lievens's own father is also mentioned in documents, and it can only have been produced during this visit.<sup>427</sup>

Lievens's drawing of Huygens indicates the direction in which he had developed stylistically since he painted Huygens in 1628-29 (Sum. 1286, 1628-9, on loan to Amsterdam, fig. 20). In contrast to the study of character in the earlier work, in which Lievens penetrated Huygens's very mind and cares, this later drawing presents Huygens as a public persona or courtier who is more aloof and self-conscious. In the manner of Van Dyck, Lievens produced a more elegant and flattering image of Huygens than the previous one. Instead of accentuating Huygens's projecting eyes as he did in the early portrait, he disguised them with a three-quarter pose. This portrait is more didactic than the earlier painting as Huygens holds out a letter denoting his profession as secretary and wears a scholar's skullcap.<sup>428</sup>

In June 1640, just after Rubens's death, Lievens relayed to Huygens an offer to complete a work begun, but left unfinished in Rubens's studio. This offer was a marker of Lievens's unflagging self-confidence, which was not inappropriate in the eyes of Huygens.<sup>429</sup> Huygens himself not only esteemed Lievens enough to sit for a second

---

<sup>427</sup> The now-lost portrait of his father Lieven Hendrickx (Sch. 241, lost) done "very recently," is recorded in his will registered January 10, 1640. It was thus presumably also made in 1639. His father was buried on May 8, 1642. De Baar, 16.

<sup>428</sup> The inscription or address is, ironically, a pious one: "Vive le Roy de Roys" ("Long live the King of Kings").

<sup>429</sup> Constantia de Wilhelm, Huygens's brother-in-law's sister maintained contact with Lievens as she lived in Antwerp. Her husband, David de Wilhelm apologized in a letter to Huygens that year for the message he

portrait around 1639, but after he returned to Holland in 1644 Huygens continued to champion Lievens, helping him gain further commissions at the Stadhouder's court (where Huygens still served as advisor).<sup>430</sup>

### *Contenance of Scipio*

A popular *exemplum virtutis* in civic and judicial contexts, the story of *Contenance of Scipio* was meant to encourage magnanimity in public officials.<sup>431</sup> In 209 BC, after conquering New Carthage (Cartagena) in Spain, Publius Cornelius Africanus was offered a particularly beautiful woman captive by his soldiers (Livy, *Histories* 26, 50).<sup>432</sup> Inadvertently telling the Spanish prince Aluccius of his love for the woman, he learned she was Aluccius's fiancé. He generously reunited the couple and furthermore passed the ransom that the parents brought on to the couple as a wedding present.<sup>433</sup> The copy after Lievens's painting shows a rigidly classicising composition in which Scipio and the bride of Carthage face each other across the center (fig. 106). The strict profile

---

was relaying to Huygens, namely that Lievens wished to ask his permission to finish a painting Rubens had begun for Huygens, a chimneypiece that was left unfinished in the studio at his death. Letter of June 6, 1640, in Schneider, 292. Gary Schwartz presumed that Huygens received the message with horror, "The Rubens painting for which Huygens had been waiting all these years was turning before his very eyes into a Lievens," but Huygens had sat for a Lievens portrait drawing the year before. Schwartz, 91.

<sup>430</sup> Schwartz, 91. Schwartz interprets the communiqué to mean that Constantia de Wilhelm had taken Lievens under her "protection" although her husband seemed hostile to Lievens and is moreover not recorded as a patron. Lievens probably gained his two major commissions in Antwerp, for the Jesuits, through the help of his wife's family who already worked for them.

<sup>431</sup> Schneider, 118.

<sup>432</sup> Peter Sutton, "The *Contenance of Scipio* by Gerbrandt van den Eeckhout (1621-1674)," *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Museum of Art* 78 (1982): 5.

<sup>433</sup> Sutton, "The *Contenance of Scipio*," 13.

poses of the Roman-style faces are appropriate to the origin of the story but novel in Lievens's work and form part of a decisive shift towards classicism.

Many artists showed Scipio's gesturing clemency in reaction to the parents' petition, rather than shaking the bride's hand, Lievens represented it. The handshake signified the sense of harmony Scipio sought to build between the Romans and the Carthaginians. The motif was likely inspired by Van Dyck's earlier *Continence of Scipio* (1620-21, Oxford, fig. 107), where the hands of the bride and groom are joined together by Scipio.<sup>434</sup> Although it would have been an important model with which Lievens was, in all likelihood, familiar, Van Dyck's handshake had a different meaning and his painting was, moreover, not a civic commission about exemplary virtue but a private commemoration of the wedding of George Villiers, Marquis of Buckingham, to Lady Catherine Manners. Lievens's transfer of the motif of the handshake from Van Dyck's private painting to a public work of art is typical of his kind of adaptation and invention in shaping the moods and meaning of his works of art.<sup>435</sup>

As noted above, Orlers described the Leiden commission as issuing jointly from the city and the Stadhouder, and although it is unclear exactly what role the court took, the impact of Huygens is unmistakable.<sup>436</sup> Around this time (1638-39) Huygens had retained the Haarlem painter Pieter de Grebber for the decorations of Frederik Hendrik's

---

<sup>434</sup> John Peacock, "Looking at Van Dyck's *Scipio* in its Contexts," *Art History* 23 (2000): 263.

<sup>435</sup> The peculiarly Roman features of Van Dyck's painting may also have inspired Lievens's figure style in this work, but Lievens reverses Van Dyck's composition, giving Scipio a more classical profile than the bride. The strict profile and Roman features of the two central characters are so striking in Lievens's oeuvre up to this point and so at odds with the monumental pathos of the Munich *Pietà*, that one is led to question the accuracy of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century copy. The rounded cheeks, pointed nose and small prominent chin of the bride are, however, consistent with those of Thermuthis, Rachel and the three daughters of Cecrops in the *Finding of Erichthonius* (Sum. 1202, c. 1639, formerly Emden). Schneider, 118, plate 24.

<sup>436</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 139.

Honselaarsdijk palace, and both Lievens's *Continnence of Scipio* and contemporary *Finding of Erichthonius* (Sum. 1202, c. 1639, formerly Emden, fig. 108), betray the impact of De Grebber's mature classicising style.<sup>437</sup> The resumption of the Stadhouder's patronage of Lievens is significant, as under Huygens's advisement it would continue through the Oranjezaal project in 1650 and beyond. Importantly for Lievens, the *Scipio* commission and the favorable mentions by Orlers and Angel indicated the broad support and potential patronage that awaited him in Holland.

### ***The Finding of Erichthonius***

Around the time he painted the *Continnence of Scipio*, Lievens produced another classicising painting, the *Finding of Erichthonius* (Sum. 1202, c. 1639, formerly Emden, fig. 108), which illustrated an episode from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Book II, 553-563) in which the three daughters of King Cecrops of Athens were given a basket by the goddess Athena but were commanded to not open it. Lievens's painting shows the moment the women disobey the goddess and, no longer able to contain their curiosity, lift the lid of the basket. They find the baby Erichthonius, the snake-tailed offspring of Hephaistos and Gaia. According to Ovid, the daughters go mad from shock at seeing the monstrous baby and throw themselves down a mountain to their deaths.<sup>438</sup> Lievens poses the full-length figures in a simple, shallow space, resembling the composition of the *Continnence of*

---

<sup>437</sup> Albert Blankert, "Classicism in Dutch painting" *Gods, Saints and Heroes: Dutch painting in the Age of Rembrandt* (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1980), 187. *Princely Patrons*, 40-44.

<sup>438</sup> The episode was illustrated almost exclusively in Northern Europe. Pigler II, 80-81.

*Scipio*. The faces, especially that of the woman in the left foreground, also follow the classical ideal established in that work and show the lasting impact on Lievens's work of the Leiden commission.

Rubens and Jordaens had made several grand depictions of the *Finding of Erichthonius*. In his painting of 1611-1617 (Vienna, fig. 109) Rubens included the deities Ceres and Pan, thereby making the composition a broad allegory of fertility or even a veiled reference to the birth of Moses, as the story in Ovid was interpreted by Augustine.<sup>439</sup> In a late version preserved only as a fragment (c. 1638-9, Oberlin) Rubens focused on the dramatic moment when one of the sisters, Aglauros, first saw Erichthonius. Jordaens's paintings of the subject are, in turn, closely related to those by Rubens.<sup>440</sup>

Lievens drew his audience into the story by turning the opening basket away from the sisters and towards the viewer. In the foreground the curious Aglauros kneels over the basket and starts to uncover it while her more prudent sister, likely Herse, is seated or kneeling beside the basket and warns her away. She both physically restrains Aglauros and gestures against the act of opening the basket, but does not prevent it. Herse's rigid profile pose and stylized profile appear to be a cipher of restraint and composure in contrast to the expression of the smiling Aglauros, whose eyes dart mischievously off to the side, expressing her curiosity and temptation to defy Athena.

---

<sup>439</sup> Ludwig Burchard, "Rubens's 'Daughters of Cecrops'", *Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin* XI (1953): 10 ff. Svetlana Alpers, "Manner and Meaning in some Rubens Mythologies," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 (1967): 283, 284. Aneta Georgievska-Shine, "From Ovid's Cecrops to Rubens's City of God in *The Finding of Erichthonius*," *Art Bulletin* 86 (2004): 66, 67.

<sup>440</sup> The first of Jacob Jordaens's two versions of the subject, based closely on Rubens's first version of a few years before, draws the viewer completely into the surprise (1617, Antwerp). In his second (c. 1635-40, Vienna), Jordaens shows the baby accidentally dumped out of the basket, an example of Jordaens' tendency to render as comic the most serious of classical stories.

The third sister, likely Pandrosos, runs in from the left to push Aglauros away from the basket. Smiling, she seems to hover between curiosity and fear, not yet having caught sight of the snake tail hanging out of the basket. Lievens showed the moment before the discovery and emphasized both the peril of disobeying Athena and the danger of curiosity, paralleling such stories as Perseus and Medusa and the death of Lot's wife. Although the patron of the *Finding of Erichthonius* is unknown, its style most resembles that of *The Contenance of Scipio* (c. 1639-4, fig. 106), and the specific choice of subject shows how Lievens entered into a visual dialogue with Rubens and Jordaens. He ambitiously responded to their interpretations of the subject with his own, and in his own mature style.<sup>441</sup>

### **Horizontal Format Biblical Paintings**

After achieving a mature monumental style in the Jesuit commissions and moving in a classicising direction with *The Contenance of Scipio*, Lievens manifested his mature Antwerp style in three large horizontal biblical history paintings made towards the end of the 1630s: *Moses trampling the Crown of Pharaoh* (Sum. 1201, c. 1639, Lille), *Pietà* (Sum. 1200, c. 1639, Munich) and *Jacob receiving Joseph's Bloody Coat* (Sum. 1203, Aix-en-Provence, c. 1639-40). Using frieze-like arrangements of full-length figures across shallow spaces, these works display a theatricality, however restrained, that was new to Lievens's work. This stage-like compositional format is another facet of

---

<sup>441</sup> Schneider, 111.

Lievens's "classicism" in Antwerp, in which he created compositions of great narrative complexity.

### ***Moses trampling the Crown of Pharaoh***

Lievens's *Moses trampling the Crown of Pharaoh* (Sum. 1201, c. 1639, Lille, fig. 110) is an excellent example of this compositional style in which full-length figures form a frieze-like arrangement across a stage-like space. It shows the child Moses stepping on Pharaoh's crown, with which he had been indulgently allowed to play. Two older scholars dressed in heavy embroidered cloaks shield him from the angry king and his soldiers. A splendidly dressed woman, probably Pharaoh's daughter Thermuthis, joins them. She had brought Moses into the royal court after she discovered him as an infant in a basket floating in the reeds on the Nile, and was raising him as her own son.<sup>442</sup>

This episode shown is not mentioned in Exodus but rather is taken from Josephus:

“... she put the infant into her father's hands: so he took him, and hugged him to his breast; and on his daughter's account, in a pleasant way, put his diadem upon his head; but Moses threw it down to the ground, and, in a puerile mood, he wreathed it round, and trod upon his feet, which seemed to bring along with evil presage concerning the kingdom of Egypt.”<sup>443</sup>

The subject was more common in the circle of Lastman than among Antwerp painters, which might indicate that Lievens painted this work for a Dutch patron for whom the

---

<sup>442</sup> This cannot be the boy's natural mother (“a daughter of Levi”), a Hebrew slave who was called by Thermuthis's maid by chance to nurse the child in Pharaoh's house as, as a slave would not be so richly dressed. Genesis 2:8.

<sup>443</sup> Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews* II, Chapter 9, in *The Works of Josephus, complete and unabridged*, trans William Whiston.



narrative, and its allegorical significance in relation to the Dutch revolt, would have resonated. Perhaps this was the painting that Orlers mentioned Frederik Hendrik commissioning from Lievens in 1639. The painting's earliest documented trace is, after all, its appearance in a sale in The Hague in 1737. It likely either came to Holland with Lievens around 1639 or after 1644 when he left Antwerp permanently.<sup>444</sup> The style of the work argues for the former date, since it shows Lievens openly adapting Van Dyck's muted and shimmering chiaroscuro and the solid figures and classicising composition of Rubens, to the classicism manifested in *The Continnence of Scipio*.<sup>445</sup>

### ***Jacob receives Joseph's Bloody Coat***

Although Orlers mentioned two commissions connected to his 1639 visit to Leiden, Lievens's *Jacob receives Joseph's Bloody Coat* (Sum. 1203, c. 1639-40, Aix-en-Provence, fig. 111) also illustrates a subject more popular in Amsterdam than in Antwerp. The painting was copied by Leonart Bramer in Holland between 1642 and 1654, affirming that it was commissioned for a Northern Netherlandish client.<sup>446</sup> In his painting two of Joseph's brothers rush in to show Jacob the now-gory coat; thus the opulent garment Jacob had given to his youngest son is now used as a tool of deception. Joseph's

---

<sup>444</sup> Lievens's *Moses trampling the Crown of Pharaoh* appeared at the Painter's Guild sale at The Hague in 1737, and was thus likely brought back to Holland from Antwerp by Lievens in 1644. Sumowski, *Gemälde* III, 1784. Schneider, 94.

<sup>445</sup> Pigler I, 96. Pigler counts over a dozen Italian versions but only a few Northern ones, for example those by Jan Pynas (1618, St. Petersburg) and Claes Moeyaert (1624, Museum, Łódź).

<sup>446</sup> Pigler, 77. Leonart Bramer's drawing after Lievens's painting shows that the painting was originally larger and had been cut down. Michiel Plomp, "'Een markwaardig verzameling teekeningen' door Leonaert Bramer," *Oud Holland* 100 (1986), 123.

prophetic dreams had established his authority over his brothers, but had also provoked their anger. The passage from Genesis where Jacob recognized the coat reads: “Then he had examined it and said, ‘It is surely my son’s tunic. A wild beast has devoured him; Joseph has surely been torn to pieces!’ Then all his sons and all his daughters arose to comfort him, but he refused to be comforted” (Genesis 37:35). Lievens shows Jacob clenching his heart and falling backward in grief, while three women surround him to catch and embrace him. The woman daubing her eye is perhaps Joseph’s mother Rachel. The composition is dominated by sentiments ranging from grief to pity.

The pathos is expressed with elegance and grace. The face of the figure of Rachel, with her prominent chin and nose, reflects a type of feminine beauty Lievens uses in Antwerp. As in *Moses trampling Pharaoh’s Crown* these classicising aspects are reinforced by the frieze-like arrangement of figures.

Lievens’s composition directly recalls Jan Pynas’s version of 1618 (St. Petersburg), which Lievens likely knew from his time as a pupil in Amsterdam. Pynas’s composition also shows a group of figures around the seated Jacob, with a brother to the left holding Joseph’s coat. Lievens set the story in a cursory stage-like structure with a wall and grape arbor opening to the landscape to the left (in Venetian fashion) where the other brothers stand, in contrast to Jan Pynas’s classical landscape with a portico and round temple.<sup>447</sup> Like *Moses trampling the Crown of Pharaoh*, Lievens’s *Jacob receives Joseph’s Bloody Coat* is an ambitious theatrical and artificial composition, rendered in Lievens’s new synthetic and classicising style and type of composition, and shows him

---

<sup>447</sup> In the *modello*, instead of the background pair Lievens showed a group of men, presumably the rest of Joseph’s brothers and the Midianite slave traders. The modello first appeared at Sotheby’s Amsterdam, November 2, 2004, lot 30 (bought in) and Sotheby’s London, December 9, 2005, lot 254 (bought in).

working very much toward fulfilling his early ambitions to be a painter of complex historical subjects.

### *Pietà*

The *Pietà* (Sum. 1200, c. 1639, Munich, fig. 113) ranks as one of Lievens's most emotionally powerful works and is also his clearest tribute to Van Dyck, in particular Van Dyck's 1634 *Pietà* (Munich, fig. 114). The figures, contained and stoic in the presence of the dead Christ, reinforce the painting's somber tone. Only a low band of light at the horizon penetrates the storm clouds that still hang overhead in the dusky sky, reinforcing the leaden mood of the composition. John holds the Christ's body up under the right shoulder, arching Christ's back and exaggerating his limpness. The light on the body of Christ closely follows Van Dyck's diffuse frontal style of illumination, but Lievens's *Pietà* is dominated by the artist's realism and the stoicism of the figures that unites them in a bond of darkened motionless sadness.

At the center, the Virgin, oblivious to the pricking pain of the thorns, coolly and matter-of-factly places the crown of thorns into an inordinately large and elaborate ceremonial paten held by Simon of Cyrene. Lievens reinforces the sense of the Virgin's suffering, a prominent theme in Catholic devotion, but also the sense of poise consistent with the somber mood of the painting.<sup>448</sup> The Magdalene's jar, the edict scroll and tools of the passion conspicuously arrayed in the foreground, as well as the incongruously

---

<sup>448</sup> In contrast, in his 1655-56 *Pietà* for the Mechelen Begijnhof, Rubens's pupil Jan Cossiers emphasized the suffering of the Virgin by having those present all look at the Virgin in sympathy, while she looks back at them.

elaborate sacramental paten held by Simon of Cyrene, make the *Pietà* more stridently Counter-Reformation in its profusion of symbolism than the *Sacrifice of Isaac* (Sum. 1194, c. 1635, Rome, fig. 97) with its ostentatious censer.<sup>449</sup>

Lievens's inflection of Van Dyck's 1634 *Pietà* is complex.<sup>450</sup> Van Dyck's painting is clearly eucharistic in tone and probably in function. Van Dyck moved all ancillary characters behind the broken body of Christ, which is propped up to display all five wounds, whereas Lievens instead emphasized each of the tools of the passion.<sup>451</sup> Van Dyck's love of elegant gestures is clearly manifested in his *Pietà* even in such details as the beautifully bent left wrist and hand of Christ, which contrast strongly with Lievens's realism. Van Dyck's rushing angels, crying cherubs and distraught Virgin reinforce the exaggerated pathos of the work, in contrast to the composure and restraint of the figures as well as the contained emotion in Lievens's *Pietà*. Lievens's interpretation is in keeping with his stylistic development as well as his personal understanding of the subject rising from his conversion to Catholicism. By clearly referring to and transforming Van Dyck's composition in an act of artistic emulation,

---

<sup>449</sup> Its *modello* (c. 1639, Amsterdam) is perhaps identical to Sch. 37a.

<sup>450</sup> The Munich canvas has been reduced in size, as is evident by comparison to the *modello*. The heads of the Virgin and left-hand angel have suffered damage and are weakly restored. Schneider sees a strong connection between Lievens's composition and Annibale Caracci's *Pietà* reproduced in an engraving by Lucas Vorstermann (Holl. 33, c. 1607). While Van Dyck's dependence on this composition by Annibale is clear, this is not the case with Lievens, who has altered key parts of the arrangement by Van Dyck, which he likely knew through Vorsterman's print or by having seen it in the collection of Scaglia in Brussels. *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 108-110.

<sup>451</sup> The tools of the passion so prominent in Lievens's painting do appear in another version of the subject by Van Dyck (Antwerp), but are barely noticeable in the bottom left-hand corner. Van Dyck's Antwerp painting was installed over the altar in the Antwerp Beguinage in which, in 1628, Van Dyck had decided to be buried. Carl Depauw and Ger Luijten, *Anthony Van Dyck as Printmaker*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1999), 258. The specific emphasis on the tools of the passion as well as the existence of a *modello* both suggest that that the work was commissioned.

Lievens both expresses his admiration for Van Dyck and seeks to improve on his work, following the practice of Rubens.<sup>452</sup>

### **Genre works around 1638: *Dance of Death***

As some of his earliest works show, Lievens approached genre painting as a serious part of the practice of a great history painter. The genre paintings from Lievens's Antwerp period, *Fighting Card Players and Death* (Sum. 1197, c. 1638, London, fig. 115) and *The Miserly Couple and Death* (Sum. 1198, 1638, Melbury Park, fig. 117), are much more overtly moralizing than Lievens's earliest genre works in Leiden, and show how diverse his sources had become.<sup>453</sup> Both paintings follow the iconographical tradition of the *Dance of Death* in which Death, as a skeleton, unexpectedly interrupts the lives of people of all ages and walks of life. The best-known *Dance of Death* was the book illustrated by Hans Holbein and published in 1538, whose images sufficiently impressed the young Rubens that he copied all the images by Holbein around 1593 (Hilversum) and in 1627 recommended to Joachim von Sandrart to copy them.<sup>454</sup>

Lievens's two scenes, which exemplify a comic and lurid approach to the theme of the

---

<sup>452</sup> Muller, 239 - 242.

<sup>453</sup> A painting of a miser called "Een schilderye, wesende een giergaert, van Lievens" was listed in the inventory of Maria-Anna van der Goes, of December 1663, Notaris A. Seville, Protocollen 1663, fol 758. Denucé, 241. The inventory also included other genre paintings including "Een fluyterken van Lievens" of a flute player, a subject not found among Lievens's genre works in Leiden. Another flute player, "Een Fluyterken van Jan Lievens", was listed in the inventory of Jan-Baptists Anthonoïne, 1691, Notaris M. Lodewyckx, Protocollen 1697, fol. 204, Nr. 98. Denucé, 358. Lastly, Jeremiah Wildens's inventory of December 30, 1652 (Notaris H. Fighé, Protocollen, 1654) lists "Een manneken met een boeck van Joannes Livens" as Nr. 529. Denucé, 166.

<sup>454</sup> Kristen Lohse Belkin, "Rubens's Latin Inscriptions on his copies after Holbein's *Dance of Death*," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 52 (1989): 245-50.

brevity of life, represent a dramatic shift away from the Leiden *vanitas* tradition as manifested in Lievens's *Boy blowing Bubbles* (Sum. 1227, c. 1628, Besançon, fig.48) and the *Vanitas Still Life* (Sum. 1299, 1627, Heino, fig. 50).

### ***Miserly Couple and Death***

Nothing in Lievens's previous work approaches the comic exaggeration of the *Miserly Couple and Death*, in which the shrieking old couple resist the skeletal figure of Death, crowned with a victor's laurel wreath, with all their strength as he takes away their plate of coins. Lievens derived the latter detail from Holbein's and added the miser's wife who, consumed by greed, vainly tries to push away the end.<sup>455</sup> Lievens also included a table laden with maps and purses and a clock and rich gilt leather on the wall in the background.<sup>456</sup> The overall tonality is subdued, giving these comic pictures a tinge of fatalism.

### ***Fighting Card Players and Death***

With its emphasis on the grotesque, the violent, and also the tragic, Lievens's *Fighting Card Players and Death* also stands at a considerable remove from his early

---

<sup>455</sup> Hans Holbein, *The Dance of Death* (1638, London: Dover Edition, 1971), 43.

<sup>456</sup> Holbein adds to his image the text of Jesus' parable of the miser in Luke 12: 20: "You fool, this very night your soul is required of you, and now who will own what you have prepared?" Holbein shows the miser in a heavily fortified room in which he is yet robbed by Death, literally following the text. This image could thus be called a history or religious painting, while Lievens's miser, defended by his wife, does not illustrate Christ's parable.

genre painting of gamblers, *Backgammon Players* (Sum 1178, c. 1623, Capetown, fig. 11). While the seated man in a cap raises his tankard in defense, his wild-eyed opponent has started from the cards table and upended it. Just as he is about to thrust his short knife down to stab his opponent, however, he is stopped by Death. The skeletal personification of Death, again crowned with a victor's laurel wreath, grabs him and attacks him with a human femur. Unlike *Miserly Couple and Death*, Lievens's *Fighting Card players and Death* does not correspond to a specific print in Holbein's set but rather inventively adapts pure genre scenes of taverns, such as Joos van Craesbeeck's *Dood is snel en fel* ("Death is violent and fast") (c. 1640-45, Antwerp) and Adriaen Brouwer's *Quarrel over a Game of Cards* (c. 1625-6, The Hague, fig. 119), to Holbein's theme.<sup>457</sup>

The caricatured face of the knife-wielding card player, whose nose and ruddy skin make him appear Moorish or African, resembles the face in one of Lievens's *tronie* prints (Holl. 88, 1635-40) and figures of *Mars* in later paintings (Sum 1247, The Hague, 1664, and Sum 1207, 1652, Amsterdam, fig. 160). He also appears as one of the courtiers in the *Moses trampling Pharaoh's crown* (Sum. 1201, c. 1639, Lille, fig. 110). In contrast to the restraint and monumentality of the *Visitation*, Lievens uses physiological exaggeration for dramatic effect in *Fighting card players and Death* and *Miserly Couple and Death*, especially the angry face of Death in the latter work. As in Holbein's series, Lievens's *Dance of Death* paintings show Death entering the scene to partake in the vice of those he has come to take away, struggling with the miser's wife over their plate of coins, and joining the fight in *Fighting card players and Death*.

---

<sup>457</sup> Schneider points to other paintings by Craesbeeck as precedents for Lievens: *Fighting card players and death (Fight before a Tavern)* (c. 1640-45, Antwerp) and *Miserly Couple and Death (Old couple awaiting Death, formerly Gotha)*. Schneider, 54-55. Vlieghe, 163, fig. 223.

The seated man swinging a jug in *Fighting Card players and Death* is a reprise of the richly dressed miser in *Miserly couple and Death*. His ugly opponent seems to be a gullible peasant or foreigner, wide-eyed in a flash of murderous rage upon discovering the humiliating fraud, but Lievens makes his victim no less guilty. Hidden cards spill from his side of the table, indicating that he is not innocent but has in fact provoked the fracas by cheating. His slackened cheeks and large beer jug testify that he is also drunk. The inscription on Lievens's own reproductive print of *Fighting Card Players and Death* (Holl. 19, 1638, fig. 116) connects the quarrel to original sin, which, like the biblical parable that underlies the Misers, further distinguishes it from Lievens's early secular genre scenes.<sup>458</sup> Lievens sensitively adapts his genre vocabulary to his new context in Antwerp and assimilates the work of Brouwer and Craesbeeck (and also Rubens) but ambitiously invests his two genre paintings with religious and tragic sentiment and somber mood typical of his history paintings.

### **Landscape paintings**

The painterly, atmospheric landscape in the background of *The Finding of Erichthonius* draws attention to a new specialty of Lievens in Antwerp. Landscape had figured minimally in his Leiden work and first entered Lievens's artistic vocabulary under the direct influence of Van Dyck in England, as manifested in Lievens's drawings

---

<sup>458</sup> The signature on the print "Joannes Lyvyus pinxit et fecit" indicates that Lievens designed and made the print himself. The inscription "*Rixas atque odia salagit dispergere serpens Antiquus, cuncta at iurgia morte cadunt,*" connects the quarrel (*rixas, iurgia*) to Satan, "serpens Antiquus." Juliette-Jo Saxton offered the following translation: "The serpent blinks to dispel quarrels and hatred/Old Man, all quarrels fall away with death." Juliette-Jo Saxton, "Lievens, 'Death and the Card Players,'" *Print Quarterly* 11 (1994): 424.



of London and Westminster (Sch. Z 166, 167) and in the background of his portrait of Jacques Gaultier (Holl. 23, c. 1633). In Antwerp, he began to paint independent landscapes.<sup>459</sup> From a brief survey of the ten landscape paintings from Lievens's Antwerp period, it is apparent that he absorbed the leading innovations and achievements of Rubens, Brouwer and Teniers and transformed them into his own idiom.

Lievens's earlier landscape paintings, such as *Landscape with Trees and Huts by a Lake* (41 x 38.5 cm, Sum. 1301, c. 1635, Leipzig, fig. 120) and *Dune Landscape with Trees* (41.5 x 35.5 cm, Sum. 1302, c. 1635, Rotterdam, fig. 121) resemble the small, atmospheric and monochromatic landscapes by Adriaen Brouwer such as *Dune Landscape under Moonlight* (c. 1635-40, Berlin, fig. 122). Lievens's painting shared with these works the rough sketchy paint texture and depiction of a similar rolling terrain with the romantic, non-specific character of typical Flemish countryside views. In *Landscape with Trees and Huts by a Lake* (Sum. 1301, c. 1635, Leipzig, fig. 120), Lievens's inclusion of huts and groups of walking peasants betray the influence of Brouwer on Lievens's earliest landscape paintings.<sup>460</sup>

---

<sup>459</sup> None of the landscape paintings is signed, thus the attributions to Lievens stem mainly from comparison to the backgrounds of his other paintings. Only one, Berlin's *Evening Landscape* (Sum. 1304, c. 1639) carries an Antwerp panel-maker's brand mark on the reverse that supports the dating. A monogram has also been reported on the *River Landscape with Willows* (Sum. 1306, c. 1640, Milwaukee).

<sup>460</sup> Eric Larsen erroneously viewed Lievens's entire landscape oeuvre to be a fiction of Schneider, attributing most of his works to Brouwer, specifically those in the collections of the Duke of Westminster (Sch. 301), Leipzig (Sum. 1301), the Duke of Sutherland (Sum. 1307) and Fondation Aetas Aurea (Sch. 307), ignoring the evidence of the painted backgrounds of Lievens's Antwerp-period works. Eric Larsen, "Brouwer ou Lievens. Étude d'un problème dans le paysage flamand," *Revue Belge d'Archeologie et d'Histoire d'art* 29 (1960): 37-44. For his part, Sumowski seemed to concur with aspects of Larsen's argument by leaving works such as the Westminster and Aetas Aurea panels out of Lievens's oeuvre, resulting in a view that ties Lievens's landscapes exclusively to those by Rubens. The painterly passages in the Aetas Aurea and London paintings are similar to each other and nearly unique in Dutch and Flemish landscape painting, and it thus follows that the very similar Westminster painting also belongs to this group, perhaps even as a pendant to the Aetas Aurea panel. For a review of the problem of the Bridgewater House *Landscape in a Cartouche of Fruit and Flower Garlands* (Sum 1307, c. 1642-44), see *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 127. Sabine Jacob, "Zur Entwicklung der Landschaftsmalerei von Jan Lievens," *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 21-25. Jacob dismisses unsigned works from

By the end of the 1630s, however, Lievens's landscapes had begun to exhibit an awareness of Rubens's small, sketch-like landscapes. Rubens's screen-like type of composition, thin paint application and painterly touch, as evidenced in the *Edge of a Forest* (c. 1630-35, Speelman Collection, fig. 123) are adapted by Lievens in his similar *Landscape with Pollard Willows* (Sum. 1303, c. 1640, Paris, fig. 124) and *Landscape with Pollard Willows* (Sum. 1304, c. 1640, Milwaukee, fig. 125). The thin, constantly moving line of Rubens's brushstroke, but above all his atmospheric transparency show their influence in Lievens's *Landscape with Pollard Willows* (Sum. 1304, c. 1640, Milwaukee, fig. 125).<sup>461</sup> The transparency and atmospheric effect that appear in Rubens's *Landscape by Moonlight* (c. 1635-40, London, fig. 126) can be clearly distinguished in Lievens's similar *Evening Landscape* (Sum. 1304, c. 1639, Berlin, fig. 127). In the Berlin *Evening Landscape* (Sum. 1304, c. 1639), Lievens emulates the transparent and reflective watery surfaces and moonlight effect in such works as Rubens's *Landscape by moonlight* (c. 1635-40, London, fig. 126).

The stippled foliage and twisting branches that appear in the backgrounds of such history paintings of the late 1630s as *Finding of Erichthonius* and *Moses trampling Pharaoh's crown*, allow the identification of Lievens's independent landscape paintings. The stippled foliage and the impasto touch increase in density into the 1640s, when Lievens painted *Landscape with Tobias and the Angel* (Sum. 1308, London, National Gallery, c. 1644, fig. 128) as well as the larger *Landscape* (Sch. 307, c. 1644, Foundation

---

Lievens's oeuvre, particularly the one in Berlin as point of departure, and ignores the evidence of documents as well as the style of the landscape backgrounds in Lievens's other paintings.

<sup>461</sup> Gustav Glück, *Die Landschaften von Peter Paul Rubens* (Vienna: Anton Schroll, 1945), 38, 66. Arthur K. Wheelock, *The Golden Age of Dutch and Flemish Painting The Edward and Sally Speelman Collection* (Houston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2000), 26, 55.

Aetas Aurea, fig. 129) and its pendant, *Evening Landscape* (Sch. 301, c. 1640, Duke of Westminster Collection, fig. 130), both with figures by David Teniers II (1610-1680).<sup>462</sup> In these paintings as well, the attribution to Lievens rests on the presence of the kind of trees and foliage found in his signed works. It appears in *Landscape* (Sch. 307, c.1644, Foundation Aetas Aurea) where nearly abstract painterly passages form the areas of both pathways, as they do in hillocks in *Evening Landscape* and *Tobias and the Angel in a Landscape*.<sup>463</sup> Lievens expresses a kind of experimental liberty in these works that is rarely surpassed in his work. Lievens also collaborated with the still life painter Jan van der Hecke who provided a floral cartouche for Lievens's brooding landscape in *Landscape in a Floral Cartouche* (Sum. 1308, c. 1642-44, Duke of Sutherland Collection, fig. 133), a painting that made its way into the imperial collection in Vienna by 1659.<sup>464</sup> By collaborating with Teniers and Van der Hecke, Lievens worked

---

<sup>462</sup> Cynthia Schneider has argued that Lievens began painting landscapes in Leiden and produced several Rembrandtesque landscape paintings in Antwerp. This identification is based on the "IL" monogram and date of 1638 on a Hercules Seghers-like mountainous panorama of a walled city in the Norton Simon Collection in Pasadena that Sumowski has since convincingly attributed to Jacques de Villiers (Sum. 2925, 1640). Cynthia P. Schneider, *Rembrandt's Landscapes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 156-159. Ivan Gaskell, *The Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection: Seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish Painting* (London: Philip Wilson, 1989), 360-362. The monogram includes "fecit", which occurs only on the painting *Miserly Couple and Death* with the identical date. The monogram has not been tested. This group lacks discernible ties to the rest of his oeuvre and is discontinuous with his Brouweresque landscapes that are so similar to the backgrounds of other paintings. While Lievens and Rembrandt began painting landscapes at roughly same time, there is no corroborating evidence in Lievens's other works that he was aware of what Rembrandt was doing, or vice versa. Lievens's interest in landscape began only when he came under the influence of Van Dyck and follows a clear line of development thereafter.

<sup>463</sup> Peter van der Ploeg et al, *Dutch and Flemish Masters from the Kremer Collection* (Amsterdam: Foundation Aetas Aurea, 2003), 104-107. Günter Böhmer, *Der Landschaftler Adriaen Brouwer* (Munich: Neuer Filser Verlag, 1940), 44, 45. Gerard Knuttel, *Adriaen Brouwer, the Master and his Work* (The Hague: Boucher, 1962), 49. Although we associate Lievens's landscape drawings with his Dutch period, it is apparent that he already began drawing landscapes in Antwerp. An Antwerp inventory of 1686 that listed a landscape painting by Lievens ("schilderye, lantscap, van Jan Lievens") also listed a sketchbook of landscape drawings by him, "een boeckken teekeningen lantschappen wesende van Jan Lievens" (lost). Inventory of Joannes Philippus Happart, February 27, 1686. Antwerp Stadsarchief, Notaris A. de Pieters, Protocollen 1686, in Denucé, 333, 337. Susanna Willemsens's inventory of July 6, 1657 lists a tronie and landscape on panel by Lievens. Notaris H. Fighé, Protocollen 1657. Denucé, 199.

<sup>464</sup> Margret Klinge, *David Teniers 1610-1690*, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Koninklijke Museum voor Schone

like a Flemish landscape specialist. Lievens's ten independent landscapes form a sizable proportion of his Antwerp-era output. He also produced a large number of landscape drawings throughout the rest of his career, especially in Amsterdam, where there was a significant market for them. None of his surviving landscape drawings, however, can be dated to the Antwerp period.

### **Portraits of the Antwerp period**

Although he painted few portraits in Antwerp, Lievens continued executing and developing *tronies* as well as portrait drawings and etchings. Lievens's portrait prints and drawings in Antwerp followed the format of Van Dyck's portrait prints and some even depict Van Dyck's *Iconographia* subjects (such as Brouwer and Vorsterman).

Lievens, who had begun producing Van Dyckian portrait prints in London, continued them Antwerp. These prints give us a measure of Lievens's ambition to position himself as a worthy successor to Van Dyck's portrait style. They also provide us with an idea of Lievens's circle of acquaintances in his first years in Antwerp, which include both Lucas Vorsterman (Sch. Z.77, c. 1640, lost, fig. 142) and Paulus Pontius (1603-1658) (after Sch. Z.66, c. 1640, lost, fig. 143), Van Dyck's main printmakers, as

---

Kunsten, 1991), 129-130. Lievens's collaboration with Teniers may have also been documented in a portrait drawing formerly thought to portray Hieronymus Bran (Sum. D 1653x, 1635-44, Konstanz). It instead closely resembles Teniers's early self-portrait in *Family Concert on a Terrace* (c. 1641, Private Collection) and therefore may be a tribute to their working relationship.

well as Jan Davidsz de Heem (Sum 1652x, c. 1635, London, fig. 135) and Adriaen Brouwer (Sum. 1594x, c. 1636-7, Paris, fig. 136).<sup>465</sup>

### ***Petrus Egidius de Morillon***

The painting of Petrus Egidius de Morillon (Sum. 1288, Budapest, 1637, fig. 134) is Lievens's only surviving painted portrait of the Antwerp period.<sup>466</sup> The bust-length figure of the aged Morillon in a three-quarter pose with long hair and beard displays little connection to Van Dyck's portrait style. The painting is similar in many respects to Lievens's *tronies* were it not for Morillon's peculiar straying eyes and drooping left eyelid. The figure is framed in an illusionary cartouche with an inscription,

“Petrus. Egidius de morr(i)on.aeta(ti)s.suae  
116.christi (16)37.  
Sobrietas.iugis.labor et (men)s.lib(era) curis  
Adsignat.vitae.lustra.t(ero)cto (me)ae.”

---

<sup>465</sup> Vorsterman had engraved Van Dyck's portrait of Lievens, and Pontius had engraved Lievens's portrait of De Heem (Sum. D Missing 65, Schneider Z. 77). Franciscus van den Wyngaerde after Jan Lievens, *Lucas Vorsterman* (Holl. LV, 30, c. 1640). Pieter de Jode II after Jan Lievens, *Paulus Pontius* (Holl. IX, 143, c. 1640, see Sum. D Missing, 60, Sch Z. 66) in I. Meyssens, *Images de divers homes d'esprit sublime*, 1649. Cornelis de Bie, *De Gulden Cabinet* (Antwerp: 1661), 497. Paulus Pontius after Jan Lievens, *Portrait of Jan Davidsz De Heem* (Holl XI, 34).

<sup>466</sup> Another painting of a figure in a cartouche that Lievens executed jointly with Van der Hecke (Sum. 1285, c. 1642-44, Vienna) has been called a portrait but does not seem to follow the styles of pose Lievens normally employed for portraits. Morillon's is the only securely identified portrait painting of Lievens's Antwerp period. Apparently Lievens's style of portraiture was not in as great demand in Antwerp, where the competition was strong, as it would be in Amsterdam later. Denucé only lists two other portraits in Antwerp collections: a portrait of a certain Cassepeel (“Een conterfytzel van Cassepeel geschildert van Jan Lievens”) was listed in the inventory of Alexander Voet, February 18, 1689, Notaris G. Casens, *Protocollen 1689*, fol. 15. Denucé, 320. A portrait of a councilor Rolaents (“Een pourtraict, teeckeninge, van sylen myn Her den Raetsher Roelants, van Lievens”) was listed among other paintings by Lievens (“giergaert...fluyterken”) and Brouwer (*Smokers*, New York) in the inventory of Maria-Anna van der Goes, of December 1663. Notaris A. Seville, *Protocollen 1663*, fol 758. Denucé, 320.

The inscription recalls the text on one of the impressions of the print of “Robert South” (Holl. 28) that identified the sitter as a hundred and twelve-year old Englishman. At the age of one hundred and sixteen years, Egidius was even older.

In Antwerp Lievens also painted *tronies* of old men such as those in Leipzig (Sum. 1279, c. 1635), St. Petersburg (Sum. 1278, c. 1635), and New Orleans (Sum. 1284, 1640, fig. 139). These are refined character studies, tinged with sentiment, and set against a black or very dark background, giving them the appearance of a finished portrait.<sup>467</sup> Part of Lievens’s intention in making *tronies* of old men would have been to disseminate examples of his skill in portraying old age.

### **Lievens’s *Iconographia***

Upon his return from Italy in 1628, Van Dyck began his project to publish a series of portrait prints later known as the *Iconographia*. By his death in 1641 he had completed eighty of the portraits; fifty-two of artists and the others of princes and scholars.<sup>468</sup> Van Dyck etched the earliest portraits of the series himself, but then turned to engravers, principally Vorsterman and Pontius, who worked from sketches. Van Dyck produced an oil sketch for his print of Lievens of 1631-32, who seems to have been inspired by the experience to produce some of his own portrait prints in a similar format.

---

<sup>467</sup> Eric Larsen, *The Paintings of Anthony van Dyck II* (Freren: Luca Verlag, 1988), 62. They also very closely resemble *tronies* made by Van Dyck as an adolescent, such as *Study head of a Bearded Man* (c. 1615-16, Madrid).

<sup>468</sup> When posthumously published by Gillis Hendricksz in 1645/6, the *Iconographia* was expanded to one hundred portraits. Anthony Van Dyck, *Icones Principum Virorum Doctorum Pictorum Chacographorum Statuorum nec non Amatorum Pictoria Artis Numero Cento* (Antwerp: Gillis Hendricksz, 1645/6).

In imitation of the prints in Van Dyck's series, Lievens added inscriptions to his English-period portrait prints of Gaultier and Lanier. When Lievens first arrived in Antwerp in 1635 he continued producing portrait prints and drawings, for example of Jan Davidsz de Heem, Adriaen Brouwer, Daniel Seghers, Lucas Vorsterman, and Paulus Pontius. He followed not only the format, style, and size of Van Dyck's prints but even used the same printmakers, indicating the depth of his involvement with Van Dyck's studio in London, and his almost total absorption of Van Dyck's style. Later Antwerp sitters included Hieronymous de Bran, Thomas Howard and David Teniers II. His total of seven Antwerp-era prints, combined with the three English-period portrait prints, were a modest output of portrait prints in comparison to Van Dyck's series, but after 1644 Lievens would continue to work in this format and style, portraying and publishing images of a wide variety of personalities ranging from patricians to scholars.<sup>469</sup> By continuing to follow the style and format of Van Dyck's portrait prints without exactly copying any of them, Lievens established a measure of distance from Van Dyck and inserted his own artistic identity into his project.

---

<sup>469</sup> Van Dyck did occasionally use black chalk drawings, such as *Adam van Noordt* (c. 1639, Rijksprentenkabinet), as designs for the respective prints (Holl. 8). In the case of *St. Jerome praying* (Holl. 15), Lievens had used an oil sketch design (Sum. 1242, c. 1630/1, Leiden). Many other prints stem from drawings, such as *The Hermit* (Holl. 50) and its sketch (Sum. 1595, Amsterdam) and *Bust of an Old Man, after Rubens* (Holl. 74) and its drawing (Sum. 1628x, location unknown). Lievens's three English prints each involve a different method of execution; one was his own etching (*Robert South*, Holl. 28), labelled "Joannes Livius fecit," another his own etching and engraving (*Jacques Gaultier*, Holl. 23), inscribed "Joannes Livius fecit et excudit." and the third was etched and engraved by Vorsterman after Lievens's painted modello (*Nicolas Lanier*, Holl. XLIII, 168iii), inscribed "Ioannes Lijvijus pinxit." In Antwerp, others, including Wyngaerde, executed the printmaking of Lievens's portraits, working from black chalk drawings that survive.

### *Jan Davidsz de Heem*

Lievens's drawing of De Heem (Sum. D 1652x, c. 1635, London, fig. 135) is typical of the masters's other four Antwerp artist portraits in that he employed a standard three-quarter pose with the sitter looking directly at the viewer. De Heem is shown resting one hand on his chest, holding a strap over his shoulder. The rich velvet bunched around his left arm is a touch derived from Van Dyck (appearing in his portrait of Lievens, for instance), its soft texture and energetic folds adding to the dynamic pattern of folds and lines framing the elegant supine hand that is so self-consciously posed. In addition to the opulent texture of velvet, the gathering of cloth attenuates the composition, while at the same time containing the pose by framing it.<sup>470</sup>

### *Adriaen Brouwer*

The idealized figure and elegant pose of Lievens's portrait drawing of Adriaen Brouwer (c. 1605-1638) (Sum. 1594x, 1635-7, Paris, fig. 136) is difficult to reconcile with the image Brouwer made of himself in *The Smokers* and Brouwer's general

---

<sup>470</sup> The two surviving still lifes that Lievens produced in Leiden (Sum. 1300, c. 1627, Amsterdam, fig. 51 and Sum. 1299, 1627, Heino, fig. 50) follow the vogue for *vanitas* subjects in that city produced by De Heem and David Bailly (1584-1657), and approximate those by De Heem so closely as to occasionally cause confusion. Bernard von Schnackenburg, "Knabe im Atelier und Bücherstilleben, zwei frühe Gemälde von Jan Lievens und ihr Leidener Kontext: Rembrandt, Jan Davidsz. de Heem, Pieter Codde," *Oud Holland* 117 (2004), 39. The style of the *Still Life* (Munich) that Schnackenburg attributes to Lievens resembles De Heem's style more closely than Lievens's, especially in details such as the fine, repetitive leaving of the pages, which is very different from how Lievens painted books in his Amsterdam *Still Life* and other paintings. The emphasis on the vanity of learning in these compositions with their stacks of books and globes perhaps signals that local interest was related to the presence of the University, as other paintings also suggest, such as De Heem's *Interior with a Student* (1628, Oxford) and Jan Lievens's *Boy studying Drawings*, (Sch. 129, c. 1630, Paris, fig. 52).



reputation for a dissolute life. Around 1635-36 Lievens portrayed Brouwer posing with his hand over his chest, his head tilted slightly and glancing upward. Lievens's drawing differs from the print by Van Dyck, who portrayed Brouwer doffing gloves, the attributes of a gentleman.<sup>471</sup>

Lievens's image of Brouwer is surprisingly artificial and sentimental and its style is dashing and graceful compared to his other portraits of this period.<sup>472</sup> As Von Bode noted, Lievens's portrait drawing was likely executed to mark the occasion of Brouwer's entry into the chamber of rhetoric, thus the pose is more theatrical than sincere.<sup>473</sup> The role-playing occurring in Brouwer's allegorical group portrait *The Smokers*, which marked the same occasion, confirms this reading.<sup>474</sup>

### ***Daniel Seghers***

Like Jan Davidsz de Heem, Daniel Seghers (1590-1661) was a highly sought-after

---

<sup>471</sup> Margret Klinge and Conrad Renger, *Adriaen Brouwer, David Teniers the Younger*, exh. cat. (London: Noortman and Brod, 1982), 52. Wilhelm von Bode, *Adriaen Brouwer, sein Leben, seine Werke*, (Berlin: Euphorion, 1924), 15. Rombouts and Van Lieris, 66.

<sup>472</sup> The light, dashing style of Lievens's drawing of Brouwer approaches the style of a slightly earlier group of drawings of courtiers made in England (c. 1632-35, Sum. D 1645x-1646x, 1647x, Düsseldorf and 1648x, London). Lievens's portrait of Brouwer was likely produced slightly before those of Jan Davidsz. De Heem (Sum 1652x, c. 1635-36, London, etched by Pontius, Holl. XI, 34), Daniel Seghers (Sum 1651x, c. 1640, London, etched by Pontius, Holl. XI, 33), and the engravers Lucas Vorsterman (Sch. Z 77, c. 1640, missing, engraved by Frans van den Wijngaerde, Holl. LV, 30) and Paulus Pontius (after Sch. Z 66, c. 1640, lost, engraved by de Jode). The De Jode print of Pontius (British Museum 1895-15-199) was published by Meyssens as part of a 1649 series of portraits that illustrated De Bie's 1661 *Gulden Cabinet*.

<sup>473</sup> Bode, 15. Sumowski, *Drawings* Vol VII, 3556. De Clippel, 203.

<sup>474</sup> Stephanie Dickey went a step further, and saw in the pose a satirical response to the elegant pose of Brouwer in Van Dyck's high-minded print. Dickey, 298. This would call for level of sarcasm at odds with Lievens's generally dignified tone. He did, however, on occasion resort to a kind of brutal realism, for instance in *Youth embracing a Young Woman* (c. 1625) and a print of a shouting man in the vein of Brouwer and Rembrandt (Holl. 29).

still-life painter, a leader in the production of cartouche and wreath figures who collaborated with Antwerp's most prominent painters including Rubens and Erasmus Quellinus (1607-1678). He was a Jesuit whose art was dedicated supporting his order and its mission. Lievens may have encountered him in connection to his 1638 commissions for that order's churches in Brussels and Antwerp. Lievens's portrait drawing of Seghers (Sum. D 1651x, 1635-44, London, fig. 140), published by Paulus Pontius (Holl. XI, 33, fig. 141), is formal and refined, with Seghers posed nearly in profile facing left, holding a palette in his right hand and a thin piece of black chalk in his left. Behind him is a cursory landscape background. Lievens showed that Segher's eyes were keenly focused on the subject he is portraying, but which is not visible to the viewer.

### ***Lucas Vorsterman***

Lucas Vorsterman engraved Van Dyck's 1631/2 portrait of Lievens, but there is no evidence the two artists met until Lievens's arrival in Antwerp in 1635. Like Lievens, Vorsterman came from Holland (he was born in Zaltbommel).<sup>475</sup> Vorsterman also engraved Lievens's portrait of Nicolas Lanier (after Sch. Z 61, c. 1634, fig. 142) before the two met, which can only indicate the direct involvement of Van Dyck, for whom Vorsterman had been engraving *Iconographia* portraits, and for whom Lievens most

---

<sup>475</sup> A Rubens protégé in Antwerp, Vorsterman eventually grew resentful of his master's dominance and, after making an attempt on Rubens's life in 1622, fled to England. After notable successes there, including commissions for Charles I, the Earl of Arundel and the Earl of Pembroke, he returned to Antwerp around 1630. Hella Robbels, "Lucas Vorsterman I" *Grove Art Online*, Oxford University Press, [www.groveart.com](http://www.groveart.com) (Accessed August 1, 2005).

probably worked in London. Vorsterman additionally engraved Lievens's drawing of Hieronymus de Bran (Sch. Z 49, c. 1635-43, San Francisco, fig. 144). In his portrait of Vorsterman, Lievens posed Vorsterman's gaunt face frontally and framed it with his wavy disheveled hair. The tilted head makes the forbidding figure seem more direct and informal.<sup>476</sup> Nevertheless, Lievens included the hat, glove and the rich costume of a gentleman, much as Van Dyck had in his elegant portrayal of Vorsterman for his *Iconographia*.

### ***Paulus Pontius***

Vorsterman's most brilliant student, Paulus Pontius (1603-1658) was the second most important engraver of Van Dyck's *Iconographia*. After Vorsterman fled Antwerp in 1624, Pontius stayed behind to work for Rubens, even residing in Rubens's house from 1624 to 1631. Pontius later engraved a number of Lievens's such as *Daniel Seghers* (after Sum. 1651x) and *Jan Davidsz de Heem* (after Sum. 1652x). Pontius in turn taught Frans van den Wyngaerde, who engraved many of Lievens's subsequent portrait designs, including that of Vorsterman (Holl. LV, 40). It is unclear when Pontius himself sat for Lievens, but the resulting image was engraved by Pieter de Jode, copied by Meysen in his "*Divers Images*," and reproduced in Cornelis de Bie's collection of artist biographies, *De Gulden Cabinet* of 1661 (fig. 143).<sup>477</sup>

---

<sup>476</sup> It resembles the pose, for example, of Rubens's *Michael Ophovius* (c. 1618/20, The Hague).

<sup>477</sup> Meysen's images included Vorsterman.

Lievens's portrait of Paulus Pontius is another acute character study that recalls the Gaultier portrait of several years before (Holl. 23, c. 1633).<sup>478</sup> As in Lievens's portrait of Vorsterman, Pontius's figure fills the pictorial space. The gesture of his hand stands out as unusual and slightly awkward, at once casual yet affected with the index and middle fingers slightly apart, recalling the gesture in Hendrick Goltzius's 1588 "pen-work" drawing of his own disfigured right hand (Haarlem).

### ***Hieronymus de Bran and Thomas Howard***

Lievens made two portraits of collectors in Antwerp: *Hieronymus de Bran* and *Thomas Howard*. Hieronymus de Bran (Sch. Z 49, c. 1635-43, San Francisco, fig. 144) was field commander of the Spanish armies in the Southern Netherlands and a collector of art, as indicated by the inscription on Vorsterman's print after Lievens (Holl. XLIII, 136, fig. 145).<sup>479</sup> De Bran's expression is similar to that of Lanier, but the pose and hands are awkward, leaving some question about how successfully Vorsterman translated Lievens's bust-length drawing into a three-quarter-length portrait in the print. Lievens's black chalk drawing of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (1586-1646), must have been produced in Antwerp between 1642-1644 (Sum. D 1607, Berlin, fig. 146).<sup>480</sup> Arundel had been, after the King, the preeminent patron of the arts and collector in England.

---

<sup>478</sup> De Bie, 497.

<sup>479</sup> Holl. XLIII, 136. The drawing was not catalogued by Schneider or Sumowski. It has been cut down into an octagonal mount (14.4 x 13.4 cm, San Francisco Museum of Fine Arts 1986-2-40). The drawing in Contance that was previously thought to be the design for the De Bran print probably shows David Teniers, as will be discussed below.

<sup>480</sup> Rolf Quednau, "Zu einem Porträt von Jan Lievens," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 43 (1980): 97-104.

Arundel had fled England after two defeats at the head of the King's army in Scotland, and after spending two years in Flanders, Arundel would find his way to Padua. Lievens depicted Arundel in a far more approachable and sympathetic manner than did Rubens (1629-30, Boston), and provides an accurate measure of the toll that his defeats and exile had taken on him.<sup>481</sup> The portrait commission seems to have come about as the result of Lievens's ongoing contact with Huygens, who likely knew Arundel from his own stay in England in 1618, and from 1621 to 1624.<sup>482</sup>

The format and variety of poses of the portrait prints and drawings in Antwerp indicate how closely Lievens modeled his work on Van Dyck. Nevertheless, his method of producing black chalk drawings from life differs from the painted *modelli* produced by Van Dyck, and his portraits are characterized by greater directness and realism than those by Van Dyck. Lievens did not expand his portraiture much beyond the circle of artists (several with attachments to Holland) with whom he was acquainted, mainly, it seems, through the painter's guild. The portraits of the Spanish general and collector De Bran and the Jesuit Seghers illustrated the extent to which Lievens assimilated, politically and religiously, to the culture of Flanders, while the portrait of Arundel suggests that Lievens maintained ties to Huygens.

### **Woodcut prints: Rubens, Jegher and Goltzius**

---

<sup>481</sup> David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his circle* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), 207.

<sup>482</sup> Strengolt, 32-49.

Lievens executed ten woodcuts while in Antwerp. These prints form one of the most fascinating yet perplexing aspects of Lievens's career, with debate centering mainly on the extent of his participation in the printmaking process.<sup>483</sup> Eight of these woodcuts are *tronies*, one is a landscape and the last is of the Biblical story of Cain and Abel. Lievens did not produce new woodcuts after leaving Antwerp in 1644, which showed that he was inspired mainly by Christoffel Jegher's (1596-1652-53) woodcut prints after Rubens.<sup>484</sup>

Lievens's powerful and energetic woodcut *Landscape with a Group of Trees* (Holl. 100, c. 1640, fig. 147) is his only landscape print, even though over eight-five landscape drawings survive. It closely follows the style of drawings such as *Decaying Pollard Willow* (Sum. D 1700x, c. 1660, Dresden, fig. 148), and copies the tall format used in a pair of drawings of tree stumps (with Sum. D 1701x, c. 1654-58, London). The print shows the tangled compositions and dynamic interplay of light and dark that adds movement to the forms, but in contrast to *Decaying Pollard Willow*, Lievens established a marked contrast between figure and ground, with only simple line structures shown

---

<sup>483</sup> Schatborn, 18. Schatborn suggests that since one example in London of the print of the *Balding man* (Holl. 106, c. 1640) has a written note identifying François Du Sart as the "sculptor" of the print, he was the woodcut printmaker. François Du Sart (c. 1600-1661) was a marble sculptor who worked first in Rome and then in England for Charles I until about 1646, whereupon he moved to The Hague. He is not otherwise known as a woodblock cutter, graphic artist or printmaker. Another François Du Sart was a master sculptor in Brussels in 1656 who also worked in The Hague. It seems more likely that the inscription identifies the sitter, therefore, rather than the printmaker. E. Benezit, *Dictionnaire critique et documentaire des Peintres, sculpteurs, dessinateurs et Graveurs* III (Paris: Librairie Gründ, 1960), 449. Peter Schatborn, *Jan Lievens 1607-1674, Prints and Drawings*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rembrandthuis, 1988), 60. The Lievens print *A Balding Man* is laying on the table in the c. 1665 painting *The Drawing Lesson* by Steen. John Walsh, *Jan Steen. The Drawing Lesson* (Los Angeles: J. P. Getty Museum, 1996), 65-66, fig. 53.

<sup>484</sup> Schneider, 84 ff. Sumowski, *Drawings of the Rembrandt School* 7 1596. Sumowski supports Schneider's assertion that Lievens cut his woodblocks himself. Mary L. Meyers, "Rubens and the Woodcuts of Christoffel Jegher," *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* XXV (1966): 17. Lievens's woodcuts were not intended to fulfill the same function as Jegher's, who was a reproductive woodcut printer of extraordinary facility and expertise, but whose work shows little evidence of his strength as a draughtsman and an artist in his own right.

outside of the stump. While the edge of the tree's foliage is delicately indicated in the woodcut, the bottom foreground patch of weeds is rendered in energetic jagged light and dark patches. This effect is achieved with such virtuosity that it seems unlikely that it was executed or cut by a reproductive artist or anyone other than Lievens himself.

Since Lievens seems to have practiced both etching and engraving himself, he likely practiced the woodcut technique on his own although he may well have learned it from Jegher.<sup>485</sup> The woodcut print *Seated Cleric* (Holl. 102) shows considerable changes from the preparatory drawing (Sum. 1596, Rotterdam, c. 1640). In the drawing, the man's cloak was left empty, but in the resulting print is rendered as shimmering velvet or satin with heavy parallel hatching. This same technique is used to indicate the dense sheen of satin cloth in the portrait etching of Gaultier (Holl. 23, c. 1633, fig 81), for instance, indicating the direct control over the process by the artist.

Lievens's *Cain and Abel* (c. 1638, Holl 99, fig. 151) seems to have been inspired by a Rubens composition now lost but preserved in a drawing (c. 1608-10, Amsterdam, fig. 152) that shows Cain beating Abel with a jawbone.<sup>486</sup> This weapon is linked to Abel's animal sacrifices, one of which is still burning on an altar to the right. God's acceptance of Abel's offerings provoked Cain, whose rejected sacrifices were missing a

---

<sup>485</sup> The limited size of Lievens's woodcut oeuvre compares, for example, to the small number of prints Jacob van Ruisdael made. Ruisdael published only eight of his thirteen increasingly accomplished etchings, and of the eight, he produced only four in quantity.

<sup>486</sup> The image is known only through an engraving sometimes attributed to Willem Buytewech (Holl. IV, I). *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 214. Rudolf Oldenbourg, *Peter Paul Rubens* (Berlin: Klassiker der Kunst, 1927), 80, fig. 38. The technique and subject of Lievens's print *Cain killing Abel* also point to Hendrick Goltzius's 1588 chiaroscuro woodcut *Hercules and Cacus* (Holl. 373). Goltzius's composition was well known, and closely followed by Abraham Bloemaert in a painted tondo *Cain and Abel* (or *Hercules and Cacus*) of c. 1588-92 (Private Collection) and by Rubens in his *Hercules fighting Fury and Discord* on the 1635 ceiling of Whitehall banqueting hall, reproduced by Jegher as a woodcut print. Myers, 22.

blood offering. Thus the animal bone also represents Cain's anger and jealousy.<sup>487</sup> The swirling column of smoke from Abel's altar served both as the provocation to Cain as well as another symbol of his anger. On the left side grow tall thistles, the weed named in the curse by which God punished Adam for his fall into sin (Genesis 3: 18, 19), a bane that fell heavily on Cain, who was a crop farmer rather than a herder like Abel.

While his portrait drawings and engravings show Lievens modeling his career after Van Dyck, the woodcut prints of his Antwerp period are an unmistakable nod to Rubens and the woodcuts he produced with Christophel Jegher. Lievens boldly and self-confidently takes up woodcut and develops himself into a virtuoso in this dynamic but waning medium, even producing a *chiaroscuro* woodcut print *Head of a Man* (Holl. 106, 1635-44, fig. 153). Although he would not produce new woodcuts after 1644, his use of the technique in Antwerp was an example of how his adventurous and experimental spirit was constantly seeking new artistic opportunities. Lievens's inventory taken at his death lists "10 stuckx houte platen" ("ten wooden plates"), equal to the number of prints attributed to him and thus likely identical with them, forming further evidence that he cut and printed his own woodcuts.<sup>488</sup>

## Leaving Antwerp in 1644

---

<sup>487</sup> Lievens removed Hercules's phallic club and Cacus's grasping for Hercules's genitals and more generally omitted Goltzius's mannerist lasciviousness. Lievens's print also bears some similarity to Titian's 1570 painting *Cain killing Abel* (Venice), especially in the pose of Cain extending his foot against Abel. Lievens employed *chiaroscuro* woodcut a single time for a *tronie* of an old man.

<sup>488</sup> They were assessed at ten guilders. Bredius I, 188. An object could be raised that Lievens's oeuvre of ten prints would have required the use of eleven plates since one was a *chiaroscuro* woodcut, necessitating another plate, but the close number strongly suggests that these plates were for his prints.



Over the nine years Lievens spent in Antwerp and Leiden, he moved beyond the portraits and landscape drawings he had made in London by executing monumental history and religious paintings. He continued to evolve in his painting style in accordance with his ambitions, competing directly with Rubens, Van Dyck and Jordaens as well as their pupils, achieving a mature and monumental style most successfully realized in the c. 1638 *Visitation*. The grandeur and monumental scale of some of his works and the prestige of clients, among others the Jesuit churches in Antwerp and Brussels, bear witness to his progress and success.

After his bold beginnings in Antwerp from 1635 to c. 1640, Lievens seems to have stopped receiving commissions for religious paintings in Flanders, perhaps because of his renewed contact with patrons in Holland. He instead branched into printmaking and landscape painting. Nevertheless, Lievens's experience as a monumental-scale history painter working in a classicising Flemish style would have appealed greatly to Constantijn Huygens, the Stadhouder in The Hague and civic leaders in Amsterdam. Such a style expressed the confidence and idealism of those who sought to give Holland international stature. The Stadhouder, Frederik Hendrik, had begun to remodel and redecorate palaces such as Ter Nieuburg and Slot Buren in the late 1630s and early 1640s, which suggested to Lievens the potential for courtly work.<sup>489</sup> These factors, perhaps with the encouragement of Constantijn Huygens, induced Lievens to return to Holland in early 1644.

---

<sup>489</sup> *Princely Patrons*, 44-45.

## Chapter 4: Amsterdam, 1644-1674

In February 1644, Lievens moved, with his wife and infant son, into one of the houses in Amsterdam owned by Judith Leyster and Jan Miense Molenaer.<sup>490</sup> Lievens returned to a city that had, in the 24 years since he completed his apprenticeship there with Lastman, grown into the wealthiest city in the world. It thus held out the greatest opportunities for a painter, especially a successful history painter from Antwerp whose Flemish style would be in great demand. Opportunities would eventually come from the Amsterdam patriciate, but Lievens's first commissions after moving to Holland in 1644 came from the court at The Hague, showing that it was almost certainly Constantijn Huygens, who had a hand in the 1639 commissions from Leiden and the Stadhouder, who induced him to move back to Holland from Antwerp.

Lievens's portrait drawing of Constantijn Huygens (Sum. D. 1598, London, fig. 104) made during his 1639 trip to Holland, in addition to correspondence about the death of Rubens in 1640, confirms that the two remained in contact while Lievens was in Antwerp.<sup>491</sup> In 1648, Huygens included Lievens among painters, distinguished for their Flemish style, who were invited to decorate the Oranjezaal in the Huis ten Bosch, Amalia van Solms's villa near The Hague. With Huygens's support, Lievens's patronage by the House of Orange continued in the form of the 1653-55 commissions in Berlin for

---

<sup>490</sup> Frima Fox Hofrichter, *Judith Leyster: A Woman Painter in Holland's Golden Age* (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1989), 18.

<sup>491</sup> Schwartz, 96-97.

Frederik Hendrik's eldest daughter Louise Henriette (1627-1657), Princess of Brandenburg.<sup>492</sup>

About one year after his arrival in Amsterdam in 1644, Lievens's wife Susannah Colijns de Nole passed away, leaving him with an infant son Jan Andrea. Jan Lievens remarried in 1648 to Cornelia de Bray, daughter of the Amsterdam notary Jan de Bray. The couple would have many children and only their burials but not their baptisms were recorded in the registers of the Reformed Church. Circumstantial evidence indicates that Lievens, who had converted to Catholicism in Antwerp, remained a Catholic after returning to Holland in 1644.<sup>493</sup>

Lievens moved his family from place to place with uncommon frequency during the last 30 years of his life. He is first recorded in Amsterdam with Molenaer and Leyster in 1644, then on the Rosengracht in 1650, in Berlin from 1653-54, near the Nieuwmarkt in Amsterdam in 1654, and in The Hague from 1654-58. Upon his return to Amsterdam in 1658 he lived on the Lauriergracht, the same street as Govaert Flinck's famous painting-house, and then on the Nieuwmarkt again from 1660-62.<sup>494</sup> By 1666 he had moved to the Hartestraat behind the Town Hall. His son Jan Andrea began independent work in 1666 and moved to his own house on the Rokin in Amsterdam in 1668.<sup>495</sup> The year before, Lievens took on the young Jonas Witsen, son of Cornelis Jansz "Hooffofficier deser Stede" (official or burgomaster of [Amsterdam]), as a pupil for 100

---

<sup>492</sup> *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 38. Schneider, 399.

<sup>493</sup> P.T.A. Swillens, "Roomsch-Katholieke kunstenaars in de 17e eeuw," *Katholiek cultureel tijdschrift I* (1946): 416, 418. Swillens points out that the marriages of Catholic artists were frequently missing from any church registers, as was the case for Lievens and Cornelia de Bray in 1648.

<sup>494</sup> Bredius I, 199, 201.

<sup>495</sup> Bredius I, 223.

guilders a year, to which fee his fellow pupils Jacob Cardoso Ribero and Aron de Chavez attested in 1669. They affirmed that Lievens had carried out the instruction diligently until 1668, but this must have consisted of the kind of drawing instruction geared to an amateur.<sup>496</sup> Lievens was then temporarily in Leiden in 1669, then in The Hague where in June 1670 he took on as student Denys Godijn for two years.<sup>497</sup> Lievens was in Leiden again in 1671 for his last documented commission, a portrait of Daniel Dubordieu and his wife.<sup>498</sup> After another stay in Leiden in 1672, he reappears on the Rosengracht in Amsterdam in late April 1674, but at his death in June 1674 lived on the Nieuwe Kaisersgracht.<sup>499</sup> At times Lievens was pressed by financial difficulty to move, but that does not seem to explain the regularity and frequency of his changes of address. He had no regular studio, and thus perhaps moved into larger quarters when commissions, such as *Brinio* (1661) or *Mars* (1664) made it necessary.

Beyond the initial portrait commission from Adriaan Trip (Sum. 1290, 1644, Private Collection, fig. 178) and a depiction of the *Adoration of the Magi* (Sum. 1205, 1644, Kingston, fig. 154) it is uncertain what Lievens produced in Amsterdam until he received the commission to work in the *Oranjezaal* in the Huis ten Bosch in The Hague in 1648. He seems to have been selling works that he made in Antwerp (such as

---

<sup>496</sup> Bredius I, 206-207.

<sup>497</sup> Denys was the son of wine merchant Jeremias Godijn (1670-1671) who agreed to pay Lievens in wine, but who sued Lievens on October of 1671 for payment for the wine, indicating that Lievens's last pupil was no longer being instructed. Denys Godijn was still helping Lievens the month before, however, when he and Lievens lived in the house of Daniel du Bordieu in Leiden, working on a portrait of Daniels wife, which Godijn was assigned to finish by October 4, 1671 under the supervision of Lievens, who was to visit him while he was working twice a week. Three of Lievens's children were apparently staying with him at the Du Bordieu residence. Bredius I, 210-212.

<sup>498</sup> Bredius I, 208-210.

<sup>499</sup> Bredius IV, Add. 142.

landscapes) that appear later in Amsterdam in the inventories of collectors such as Rembrandt (in 1656) and the dealer Johannes de Renialme (in 1657).<sup>500</sup> Nevertheless, beginning in 1648 Lievens consistently participated in the most important painted decorative cycles in Holland. These large-scale public commissions include the Oranjezaal in the Huis ten Bosch, the Schloß Oranienburg in Berlin (1653-55), Amsterdam's new Town Hall (1656, 1661), the *Statenzaal* in The Hague (1664) and finally the Rijnlandshuis in Leiden (1669). Lievens was one of the most sought-after painters for princely palaces and the halls of power in Holland at the height of its Golden Age.

Jan Lievens arrived in Amsterdam at a moment when taste began to shift away from the monochromatic and sober realism that characterized Dutch painting of the second quarter of the century.<sup>501</sup> Lievens's experience at the English court and his prescient, deliberate development of a distinctly Flemish style of history painting were now rendering a substantial return. That style, which combined the monumentality of Rubens with the elegance and atmosphere of Van Dyck, continued to develop as he adapted, in each commissioned work, to his context with exceptional sensitivity and ability. Lievens's classicistic style placed him on the side of the "reformers" in the debates pitting idealism against realism in art, poetry and theatre. The "classicist" cause had no academy yet, but its case was championed by the poet Joost van den Vondel in his *Aenleidinge ter Nederduitsche dichtkunst* of 1650, in which he advocates a return to

---

<sup>500</sup> Bredius I, 230-239. At his death in 1657, the dealer Johannes de Renialme owned four landscapes out of an astonishing eighteen paintings by Lievens. The July 25-26, 1656 inventory of Rembrandt's goods for the bankruptcy court lists three landscapes out of eight paintings by Lievens as well as an album containing Lievens's prints. Strauss and Van der Meulen, 349-377.

<sup>501</sup> Schneider, 64.

ancient Greek and Roman ideals and principles in composing poetry and drama. For Lievens, however, it was probably Huygens's support rather than any theoretical allegiance (or even consistency) that led him to his first major commissions in projects undertaken by classicist architects Jacob van Campen and Pieter Post and a portrait commission from Vondel himself, since Huygens was directly involved in choosing painters for the Oranjezaal.<sup>502</sup> In his 1675-80 *Teutsche Academie*, Honthorst's pupil and arch-classicist Joachim von Sandrart excluded Lievens from the classicist camp because he had not traveled to Italy and took little interest in studies after the Antique and later periods,

“Von denjenigen, welche nirgens als in ihrem Vaterland gewesen, ohne dass die Niederland in der Nähe durchreist, ware auch Johannes Lievens, von Leyden, der unter denselben fast zum allerhöchsten gestiegen. In grosse Historien brachte er viele Contrafäte nach dem Leben, die er wohl colorierte, und gute Wissenschaft hatte, die Farben zu halten: Nach der Antichen weit hinaus sehenden Studien fragte er nicht viel, sondern bliebe in seinen Werken, bey seiner eignen und nicht bösen Manier.”<sup>503</sup>

(“Of those that were never anywhere other than their Fatherland, without that he traveled in the Netherlands and the area, was also Jan Lievens from Leiden, who under the same rose to the uppermost level. Inside large histories he added many faces from life which he colored, and had good knowledge to handle the colors: of studies after the Antique looking far beyond he did not demand much, but in his works stayed with his own not terrible manner.”)<sup>504</sup>

---

<sup>502</sup> Gerrit van Honthorst's pupil Joachim von Sandrart, a doctrinaire classicist, recognized that Lieven did not rigidly conform to the Antique in his figure style but kept to his own manner (“Nach der Antichen weit hinaus sehenden Studien fragte er nicht viel, sondern bliebe in seinen Werken, bey seiner eignen und nicht bösen Manier.”) Sandrart, 313, in Schneider, 300.

<sup>503</sup> Joachim von Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie der elderl Bau-, Bild – und Mahlery-Künste* (Nurenberg: 1675-80): 313.

<sup>504</sup> Translation mine.

Lievens's Antwerp-period landscape paintings were also popular with Amsterdam collectors, but he carved a niche of his own out of the large collector's market for finished Flemish-style landscape drawings in pen and ink. Lievens made many more portraits in Amsterdam than in Antwerp, and his sitters included, among others, the philosopher René Descartes, the burgomaster Andries de Graaf, the poet and playwright Jan Vos (1610-1667), and covered a broad sweep of the Dutch intelligentsia and patriciate. In 1654 the English agent and collector Sir Robert Kerr wrote in a letter to his son that the artist: "hath so high a conceit of himself that he thinks there is none to be compaired with him in all Germany, Holland nor the rest of the 17 provinces."<sup>505</sup> Lievens continued to be the exceptionally self-confident individual Huygens had recognized when he knew him as a young man.<sup>506</sup>

This chapter will begin by surveying Lievens's many successes as a history painter after 1644. It will then examine Lievens's portraits and finally touch on his landscape drawings. While the works in the latter two categories have enjoyed modern critical success, the commissioned public works of Lievens's maturity, such as the *Brinio* in the Amsterdam Town Hall, the *Mars* in the *Statenzaal* in The Hague and *Justice receiving the Corpus Juris from Time* in the Rijnlandshuis in Leiden, were what showed him fulfilling his grand ambitions. They exhibit the full complexity, continuing artistic development and adaptability of Lievens's style, which was carefully cultivated towards history painting after the model of Rubens.

---

<sup>505</sup> John M. Gray, *Notes on the art treasures at New-Battle Abbey* (Midlothian: 1887), 12, in Schneider, 303.

<sup>506</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

### From Antwerp to the *Oranjezaal* (1644-1650)

In 1644 Lievens painted the *Adoration of the Magi* (Sum. 1205, Kingston, fig. 154). The arch-topped composition was inspired by Rubens's similarly vertical 1624 *Adoration of the Magi* for the Abbey church of St. Michael, but Lievens executed it in the small scale (97 cm tall) of his early *Christ on the Cross* (129 cm tall, Sum. 1245, 1631, Nancy, fig. 59). Lievens seems to have drawn not only the vertical format from Rubens's work but also details such as the camel heads in silhouette in the background and the star of Bethlehem dominating the night sky. Lievens's work is much darker, however, and more subdued. The Virgin, Child and first Magus are all nearly in profile. The gift that the kneeling wise man presents to the Christ child resembles a chalice. In the middle ground are the other Magi bearing their gifts.

Although executed with speed, and lacking in richness and detail, this work seems to have been the one commissioned or acquired from Lievens by the Stadhouder or his wife with the advice of Huygens. A painting described as "Een Offerhande van de Drie Wijsen tot Bethlehem aen't kindeken Jesus gedaen, gemaect bij Jan Lievense, sonder lijst" ("The worship of the Three Magi at Bethlehem, of the Child Jesus, made by Jan Lievens, without frame") is listed in the 1654-68 inventories of Amalia von Solms.<sup>507</sup> Lievens's painting closely matches the dimensions of the paintings in Rembrandt's *Passion* series for Frederik Hendrik, which range from 92 to 97 cm in height, and may

---

<sup>507</sup> Nr. 1257, "Een Offerhande van de Drie Wijsen tot Behlehem aen't kindeken Jesus gedaen, gemaect bij Jan lievense, sonder lijst." Inventory of Collection of Amalia van Solms, 1654-58. Koninklijk Huisarchief, The Hague, inv. no. A 14, XII, 16, Nr. 1257, in a forthcoming catalogue entry by David DeWitt. The painting was described in later inventories as by Rubens and Erasmus Quellinus. Sumowski, *Gemälde* III, 1785.



have been intended to complement them in its depiction of an event from the life of Christ. The darkness of the scene is unusual even for Lievens, and may be his attempt, following his usual method, to adapt his design to the preexisting set of very dark paintings by Rembrandt installed in the Stadhouder's quarters in The Hague. If it were conceived as part of the series it would have served as a kind of vindication for Lievens, after he failed to win the original commission.

### **Oranjezaal, *The Five Muses***

By early 1648, Lievens was enlisted by Huygens to participate in one of the most complex and ambitious decorative painting projects of the age, *The Oranjezaal* in the Huis ten Bosch, commissioned by the Stadhouder's widow Amalia van Solms. What began in 1645 as a suburban villa or "lusthof" outside The Hague eventually became her residence.<sup>508</sup> After Frederik Hendrik's sudden death on March 14, 1647, she transformed the central cruciform space into a memorial hall by adding a cupola and planning an extensive cycle of paintings for which her secretary Constantijn Huygens and Jacob van Campen determined the iconography and chose the artists who would paint them.<sup>509</sup>

Following the tastes of both the Stadhouder and his widow, Huygens and Van Campen had drawn up lists of painters whose style roughly fell within what is understood as the kind of international-Flemish style Lievens had developed in Antwerp.<sup>510</sup> Van

---

<sup>508</sup> The cornerstone was laid in September 1645. Peter-Raupp, 11.

<sup>509</sup> Hanna Peter-Raupp, *Die Ikonographie des Oranjezaal* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1980), 9-12.

<sup>510</sup> *Princely Patrons*, 57.

Campan then sent “memoriae,” or written instructions, and a sketch of the direction of the light to the artists and Huygens ordered the canvases from François Olivier on December 4, 1647.<sup>511</sup>

Lievens was assigned “De muysen besigh met sijn geboorte star opte soecken” (“the Muses busy looking up his birth star”) on the west wall (Sum. 1206, 1650, fig. 157). His composition showed five of the nine goddesses sitting on the slopes of Mount Parnassus, reading books and scrolls. Lievens glorified the triumphant future of Frederik Hendrik as ordained by the stars and directed this glory towards the adjacent *Allegory of the Birth of Frederik Hendrik* (c. 1650, fig. 159) by Cesar van Everdingen (1616/17-1678).<sup>512</sup> Only the muse of astronomy, Urania, can be identified with any certainty at all by the astronomical and astrological instruments at her feet and a celestial globe under her right arm.<sup>513</sup>

The west wall (fig. 156) with Lievens’s painting concerned the birth and training of Frederik Hendrik, the north wall his investiture, the south his marriage to Amalia van Solms, and the east wall dealt with his triumph and apotheosis.<sup>514</sup> The decorations were also divided into three horizontal registers: the bottom, a triumphal procession; the center

---

<sup>511</sup> Four of the memoriae survive. Jacob Jordaens registered his objection to being so constrained by the designs of another painter (Van Campen). Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, 54-55. Peter-Raupp, 14. On the registration of the May 31, 1650 burial of an unnamed child in the Nieuwe Kerk, Jan Lievens was recorded as living on the Rosengracht in Amsterdam. Bredius I, 197.

<sup>512</sup> Peter-Raupp, 52.

<sup>513</sup> J. G. van Gelder, “De Schilders an de Oranjezaal,” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek II* (1948/49): 150. Despite the lack of attributes, the first restorer of the paintings, Jan van Dijk, proposed an identification of the muses in Lievens’s scene as Clio, Polyhymnia, Thalia and Erato with Urania, but Schneider objected that not only were two musical muses in this group, but also the identifications could not be supported by characteristic attributes. Schneider, 89.

<sup>514</sup> *Princely Patrons*, 50, 51.

(with Lievens's painting), the life of Frederik Hendrik; and the paintings above, heavenly allegories responding to each stage in the Stadhouder's life.<sup>515</sup> Lievens's painting was installed in an ensemble of what were originally eight separate canvases on the birth and training of Frederik Hendrik, including Cesar van Everdingen's *Allegory* (fig. 159) and *The Four Muses* (fig. 158) in the middle register, flanked by Theodoor van Thulden's *Education of Frederik Hendrik by Pallas, Mercury and Chiron* to the left and Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert's *Frederik Hendrik and Maurits at Nieuwpoort*.<sup>516</sup> Below them Salomon de Bray's two *Triumphal Procession* paintings flanked Van Thulden's *Vulcan's Forge* and *Venus at Vulcan's Forge*. Jacob van Campen painted *Apollo and Aurora* on the wooden vaults overhead, while Salomon de Bray's grisaille cartouche with the birthday of Frederik Hendrik was installed below Van Everdingen's *Allegory*.

Lievens's work had to be closely coordinated to the adjacent canvases. It had to direct praise towards Cesar van Everdingen's *Allegory of the Birth of Frederik Hendrik* to its right, but it also had to complement Van Everdingen's *The Four Muses* on the opposite side of the *Allegory*. These four muses were shown occupied by composing adulatory verses to Frederik Hendrik.<sup>517</sup> Overhead in the vault, Van Campen painted Apollo with Aurora heralding the dawn of a new Golden Age that had been initiated by the birth of the Stadhouder. The star that Lievens's Muses seek gave cosmic assent to Frederik Hendrik's rule, heralding a new Golden Age.

---

<sup>515</sup> *Princely Patrons*, 50.

<sup>516</sup> Salomon de Bray's painting inscribed with the hour and day of the Stadhouder's birth was removed to make way for a door, and is now in the collection of the Mauritshuis (cat. 437). Van Gelder, 149.

<sup>517</sup> Albert Blanckert and Nathalie Dufais posited that the harmony achieved between the pendant paintings by Van Everdingen and Lievens partly resulted from the complimentary character of their differing styles. Albert Blanckert et al, *Dutch Classicism*, exh. cat. (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans van Beuningen, 1999), 179.

The cycle of paintings that formed the most obvious model for Huygens and Van Campen was Rubens's series of the life of Henry IV of France commissioned by Marie de Medici (c. 1621-25, Paris).<sup>518</sup> Like Rubens, Huygens and Van Campen followed the rhetorical principles for eulogies or funeral orations: that they contain "much praise, minimal mourning and condolences," principles followed as well in the design of the 1620 tomb of William the Silent in the Nieuwe Kerk in Delft.<sup>519</sup> The imagery also brings to mind the imagery of such triumphal entries or processions as Rubens's *Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi* of 1634.

A similar source, one of the gates designed by Frans Floris for the triumphal entry of Phillip II into Antwerp in 1549, may be behind the division of the nine Muses into two mainly anonymous groups, representing the arts and sciences respectively.<sup>520</sup> Traditionally the Muses are only shown nude in the context of their musical concerts. Lievens's nude figures were thus intended to form a single group with the remaining four nude Muses in Van Everdingen's pendant, who are busy "...vaersen tot sijn lof te rijmen" (rhyming verses to [Frederik Hendrik's] praise).<sup>521</sup> Salomon de Bray's grisaille cartouche that was originally installed below the *Allegory* gave Frederik Hendrik's birth date of January 29, 1584, but was removed (to the Mauritshuis) and replaced by a simple

---

<sup>518</sup> Another prominent example was Rubens's ceiling to the Banqueting Hall, Whitehall (1635). Van der Ploeg and Vanmeeren, 50.

<sup>519</sup> Peter-Raupp, 52. B. Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie vande Oranjezaal in Huis ten Bosch," *Oud Holland* 96 (1982): 157-160.

<sup>520</sup> Peter-Raupp, 55. The decoration involving the Muses was commemorated in a reproductive engraving by Francis Huys, published by Hieronymous Cock. Holl IX, 162. Lievens, with van Everdingen, was counted among the "seven or eight best painters in the Land." Journal entry of Prince Willem Frederik, in Blanckert et al, *Dutch Classicism*, 179, n.5.

<sup>521</sup> Van Gelder, 150. Peter-Raupp, 54. *Dutch Classicism*, 176-179.

inscription on the frame below.<sup>522</sup> That date served as the key for Lievens's painting, as Urania points to the corresponding constellation on her celestial globe, the figure of water-bearing Aquarius, thus announcing the conclusion of the Muses.<sup>523</sup> Finding the birth star, while related to the then-common practice of drawing up elaborate horoscopes or astrological tables known as genitures, in this decorative cycle suggests that Frederik Hendrik's military and political successes were pre-ordained.<sup>524</sup>

Urania looks out at the viewer with a desultory stare and the gesture by which she touches the globe with her crooked right index finger goes almost unnoticed. The psychological disconnection between Lievens's Muses matches that between the figures in many of Lievens's earlier works such as *Prince Charles Louis the Palatinate and Wolrad von Plessen as Aristotle and the young Alexander* (Sum. 1186, 1631, Los Angeles, fig. 76). While it might be partly a sign of courtly detachment, in this case Lievens harmonizes his composition of *The Five Muses* with great sensitivity to the quality of interaction, as well as the poses, in the pendant composition by Cesar van Everdingen. Like his teacher Gerrit van Honthorst, Cesar van Everdingen continued to practice a formal, classicised Caravaggism through his entire career, and in adapting his work to this context Lievens in a sense revived his own earlier Caravaggism.

The fleshiness of Lievens's figures, however, is closer to the style of Jacob

---

<sup>522</sup> Peter-Raupp, 37.

<sup>523</sup> The goddess at the center embroiders into the rich tapestry seen most clearly at the center right, but which extends to the space between the two foreground muses. Lievens's love of heavy embroidered fabrics recalls his father's occupation as a master embroiderer. Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 132.

<sup>524</sup> Following the theory of the four elements, the planets were still thought to have real effects on people's lives. William R. Newman and Anthony Grafton, "Introduction: the Problematic Status of Astrology and Alchemy in Premodern Europe," *Secrets of Nature: Astrology and Alchemy in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2004): 1-21.

Jordaens (painter of the largest canvases in the Oranjezaal) and Rubens than to Cesar van Everdingen, while the soft, direct, diffused and attenuated elegance of the figures' gestures reflects Lievens's admiration for Van Dyck. The faces of the Muses, especially the one in the right foreground, represent a shift away from the severely Roman profile of the 1630s towards the type in *Triumph of Peace* (Sum. 1207, 1652, Amsterdam, fig. 160).<sup>525</sup> These Flemish influences aligned Lievens's art to the taste of the Stadhouder and his court, and Lievens had demonstrated his ability to adapt and harmonize his work with those of others in the context of large projects.<sup>526</sup>

### ***Triumph of Peace***

The large *Triumph of Peace* (220 x 204 cm, Sum. 1207, 1652, Amsterdam, fig. 160) is one of Lievens's most ambitious paintings. No trace remains of a commission for this work, but the composition and theme are closely related to other works by Lievens of the early 1650s. Although the painting postdates the signing of the Treaty of Münster (1648) by four years, it seems conceived as an emblem of the United Provinces itself at peace. It is far less elaborate and specific than the allegories on the *Peace of Munster* by Jacob Jordaens (1654, Oslo) and Adriaen van Nieulandt (1650, Amsterdam)

---

<sup>525</sup> Cf. *Continece of Scipio* (Sch. 106, c. 1639/40, formerly Leiden) and other works of that decade such as the *Visitation* (Sum. 1196, c. 1638, Paris). The shift in feminine ideal seems to coincide with Lievens's second marriage, to Cornelia de Bray. De Baar, 17.

<sup>526</sup> While Frederik Hendrik had, in his lifetime, acquired only three paintings by Lievens in contrast to many more by Rembrandt and considerably more again by Thomas Willebroards Bosschaert, (who truly did dedicate himself to the style of Van Dyck), it was towards this kind of large-scale history painting that Lievens had been consistently directing his abilities. Frederik Hendrik ordered 20 paintings from Bosschaert between 1641 and 1647. Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, 56.

although larger than both. At the center of Lievens's composition sits Peace holding an olive branch and being crowned by Athena with a laurel wreath of victory. Under Peace's foot is the bound and seething figure of War or Mars, particularly hideous in his arrogantly plumed helmet. To the left two putti play with his chains (one binding the other!) while to the right another playfully taps a war drum. Behind Peace two cornucopia-bearing figures (strongly reminiscent of the angels in the c. 1639 *Pietà*, fig. 113) arrive while to the upper left more putti descend from heaven with olive branches and floral garlands, received by attendants. The dynamic painting is additionally energized with flashes of color in the blue robe of Athena, and Athena's deep red cloak. A backlit putto flies into the warm blue sky to the upper left, an especially marvelous effect.

Lievens's monumentality forms a strong contrast to the dramatic movement and masque-like theatricality of Rubens's comparable *Minerva protects Pax from Mars*, painted as a gift to Charles I, of around 1629-30.<sup>527</sup> Lievens sustained a lifelong interest in complex grand history painting and the problems it presented. *Triumph of Peace* was a successful example and, unlike Lievens's allegories of peace for the Brandenburg Court, *Triumph of Peace* is at once a chaste and complex allegory. Its scale, similar to that of Lievens's 1656 *Quintus Fabius Maximus*, would indicate a civic commission, but the

---

<sup>527</sup> The contemporary clothing and hairstyles of the figures and specific, portrait-like facial features of *Peace* have further suggested to the authors of the Braunschweig catalogue that the painting was intended to be a *portrait historiée* of an Orange princess, perhaps Louise Henriette (1627-1667). This cannot be substantiated by comparison to any known portraits of the Princess, as in the *Allegory of the Marriage of Louise Henriette and Friedrich Wilhelm, Elector of Brandenburg*, c. 1650. The Braunschweig authors state that the composition lay "...so far from [Lievens's] interests" that it must have been commissioned by his Berlin patrons, but the allegories he painted for them on this theme are decidedly more erotic and private, suggesting that the Amsterdam canvas *Triumph of Peace* had more to do with his Amsterdam clients and was more likely related to the Town Hall project in some way. No portrait model, commission or any other concrete tie to such a commission survives, and Lievens's next commission would be for the Oranienburg, not the Town Hall. *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 111-112. *Triumph of Peace* was assessed at 100 guilders, half of the value of his meager estate. Bredius I, 187.

new Town Hall of Amsterdam would not be ready for decoration for another three years, in 1655. The function of this work, therefore, remains unclear, since it seems to have been the painting retained by Lievens until his death in 1674.

### **Schloß Oranienburg, in Bützow, 1653-1655**

Princess Louise Henriette, Frederik Hendrik's oldest daughter, married Frederick William of Hohenzollern, the Elector of Brandenburg, in 1646.<sup>528</sup> She built her own lusthof, the Schloß Oranienburg, in Bützow near Berlin, from 1652-53, and then engaged Dutch artists, including Jan Lievens, Gerrit van Honthorst, Govaert Flinck and Jan Mijtens (1614-1670) to produce portraits, allegories and mythologies to decorate it. Lievens lived in Berlin from 1653 to 1655, where he produced two *portraits historiés* as chimneypieces, the *Mars and Venus* (Sum. 1208, 1653, Berlin, fig. 161), and *Diana at the Hunt* (Sum. 1209, 1654, Potsdam, fig. 162). A third painting, *The Arts triumphing over War* is lost, but must have been very similar to the 1652 *Triumph of Peace*.<sup>529</sup> For Lievens, these commissions and the continuation of princely patronage was one of the most concrete positive results of his success with the *Five Muses* in the Oranjezaal. The erotic tone, nudity, corpulence and classical theme of *Mars and Venus* and *The Hunt of*

---

<sup>528</sup> *Princely Patrons*, 96-97.

<sup>529</sup> The chimneypiece was listed as showing "...die Künste über den Krieg triumphiren" in the 1743 Inventory of Schloß Oranienburg in Gerd Bartoscheck, *Gemälde aus Schloß Oranienburg*, (Oranienburg: Kriesmuseum, 1978), 14. *Onder den Oranje boom* II, 266. As it was certainly installed between 1653 and 1655 and included in the 1699 inventory, it was not identical with the painting in Lievens's 1674 Amsterdam inventory.



*Diana* are consistent with the *Five Muses*.<sup>530</sup> Lievens was back in Amsterdam in 1654 when he painted the portrait of Sir Robert Kerr (Sum. 1294, 1654, Edinburgh), who wrote to his son that Lievens was “the Duke of Brandenburg’s paynter.”<sup>531</sup> Lievens was documented as vacating his residence in Berlin in 1655.<sup>532</sup>

### ***Mars and Venus***

In *Mars and Venus* (Sum. 1210, 1653-54, Berlin, fig. 161), Mars embraces the seated goddess who gazes back at him. In a thinly veiled symbolic neutralization of his violent power, she surreptitiously relieves him of his baton and passes it on to a putto stealing his sword while other putti make off with Mars’s helmet and banners.<sup>533</sup> Mars spreads his hand over Venus’s breast, a gesture echoed in her hand spreading over her fallen cloak, expressing a kind of sexual parity in their encounter in a way that recalls Lievens’s *Youth and young Woman* (c. 1625, formerly Brussels, fig. 10). The faces and even the poses and the bosom-grasping gesture found in a similar work by Lievens, *Mars and Venus* (Sum. 1210, c. 1654, Poznań, fig. 163) resemble those in Thomas Willebroirts

---

<sup>530</sup> The arched top is further indication that the painting was installed in the architecture of a room. *Onder den Oranje boom*, 266. *Jan Lievens, Ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 110. *Onder den Oranje boom*, 56.

<sup>531</sup> Kerr instructed his son to retrieve the portrait at Lievens’s abode in Amsterdam near the “new market... at the signe of the fleur-de-luce.” Kerr, in Schneider, 303.

<sup>532</sup> A painter “Livii” is mentioned in a letter of September 14, 1655, as having vacated a house owned by the widow of the chancellor Fromholt in Berlin. Schneider-Ekkart, 399.

<sup>533</sup> Schneider suggests that this was the painting begun by Rubens for Huygens and completed by Lievens after Rubens’s death. It has always been documented as a commissioned work for the Princess Louise Henriette, made while Lievens was in Berlin. Schneider, 65, 292, 293. Sumowski, *Gemälde III*, 1786. *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 112. *Onder den Oranje Boom*, 266.

Bosschaert's earlier *portrait historiée* of Louise Henriette and Frederick as *Dido and Aeneas* of 1646 (Berlin), which was painted the year the couple were married in The Hague.<sup>534</sup>

The style and erotic nature of the Poznań painting are similar to the Berlin *Mars and Venus*, and in both paintings the opulent and fashionable pearl-strung coiffures point to a connection with the court of Louise Henriette. In the later composition the sub-theme of disarmament is replaced by the erotic as Mars's hand touching Venus's bared white breast becomes the central element. Cupid pushes Mars onto Venus while she pulls him near, touching his hand. Her static and recumbent form is dominated by his dynamic and unstable body, a contrast to the classical solidity and clever subterfuge of the *Mars and Venus* for the Oranienburg.

### ***Diana at the Hunt***

The goddess of the hunt Diana was the favorite guise of Amalia van Solms, and Louise Henriette carried on this tradition by commissioning *Diana at the Hunt* (Sum. 1209, 1654, Potsdam, fig. 162).<sup>535</sup> The nude goddess of the hunt sits on a bank with a little lapdog beside her and a hunting dog to the left adoringly staring up at her. Three companions join Diana. The companion to the right holds a prize of a dead pheasant with its wings spread out, and in a wonderful echo, the companion behind carries a hunting

---

<sup>534</sup> *Princely Patrons*, 40.

<sup>535</sup> Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms as Diana* (1632, Dessau-Wörlitz).

falcon, whose wings are also spread. In the facial features of one of the companions Amalia's youngest daughter Maria (1642-1688) can be recognized.<sup>536</sup>

*Diana at the Hunt* resembles the composition of Lievens's *The Five Muses* for the *Oranjezaal*, only in mirror image, with Diana assuming the pose of Urania and her companions surrounding her in the manner of the Muses. Diana's entourage seems more prepossessed and courtly than the Muses, especially the affectation of the companion to the right in the elaborately plumed hat, who touches her own chin and neck. Diana's nudity suggests that she is readying to bathe, recalling the story of Actaeon, who turned into a stag when Diana noticed him watching her bathing with her companions. Here Diana's stare carries a softly lethal import. As with *The Finding of Erichthonius* (Sum. 1202, c. 1639, formerly Emden, fig. 108), this painting confronts the viewer with the peril of looking.

Lievens's commissions for the Oranienburg effectively concluded his work for the House of Orange. The presence of Jan Mijtens (who worked in the manner of Van Dyck) at the Oranienburg and Govaert Flinck (who was beginning to do the same), seems to have encouraged Lievens to exaggerate his Flemish style for this court, whose tastes were decidedly more *lustig* than those prevalent in The Hague. Interestingly, the commissions he received included not a single independent portrait, the genre in which Huygens had encouraged the 20-year old Lievens to apply himself. However, they did indicate a courtly interest in Lievens's ability as a history painter who could adapt to client's demands with skill and deference and assimilate the styles of others rather than rigidly adhere to a single mode.

---

<sup>536</sup> Jan Mijtens made a later portrait of Maria (1666, Apeldorn), also in the guise of Diana. *Onder den Oranje Boom*, 372.

## **Patricians and Republicans in Amsterdam: works for the new Town Hall**

After returning to Holland from Berlin in 1655, Lievens settled in The Hague where he was one of the founding members of the painters' confraternity *Pictura* in 1656.<sup>537</sup> His choice of The Hague reveals the influence of Huygens, who had been so helpful in securing court patronage for Lievens to this point. After the premature death in 1650 of Frederik Hendrik's son, Willem II, the States General suspended the Stadholderate and the permanent captaincy-general of the House of Orange to prevent the Stadhouder from seizing military control of the republic in the future, thus bringing about a "Stadhouderless" period (1650-1672). Lievens's clientele in this period shifted, as the locus of power in the Netherlands moved away from the House of Orange to the patriciate and civic leaders of Amsterdam, where Lievens moved in 1658. He quickly received a commission for a major work for the new Town Hall, a monumental building begun in 1648 and dedicated 1655. The architect of the building, Jacob van Campen, had worked with Huygens on the program of the Oranjezaal and together they had included Lievens's name on the lists of candidates for the decorations. The Amsterdam commission was for the important chimneypiece in the burgomaster's chamber, *Quintus Fabius Maximus dismounting before his Son* (Sum. 1211, 1656, Amsterdam, fig. 166).

Van Campen's long-standing esteem for Lievens was illustrated by an anecdote in a letter from Jan Brosterhuisen to Huygens in July 23, 1633, who relayed to Huygens that Van Campen's offered to paint "a white one to match Lievens's black one"; a pendant to

---

<sup>537</sup> Buijsen et al, *Haagse Schilders in de Gouden Eeuw*, 193.

Lievens's dark portrait of Huygens of c. 1628-29 (Sum. 1286, on loan to Amsterdam). Also working with Van Campen on the new Amsterdam Town Hall was the sculptor Artus Quellinus, brother of Erasmus II, an eminent Antwerp painter. Erasmus II Quellinus had also been a collector of Lievens's art (Sch. 319, lost).<sup>538</sup> Whether Lievens's marriage to the daughter of Antwerp sculptor Andries Colijns de Nole had any impact on Quellinus's selection of Lievens is uncertain.

Lievens's portrait drawings of the powerful Amsterdam patricians Andries de Graeff (1611-1677) (Sum. D. 1613, 1657, Haarlem, fig. 164), Johannes van Wttenbogaert (1608-1680) (Sum. D. 1604, 1650, Amsterdam, fig. 165) and Joan Huydecoper (1625-1704) (Sch. 242, before 1662, lost) and possibly one of the state pensionary Johan de Witt, de facto head of state from 1653 to 1672 (Sch. Z 80, before 1672, lost), show that he maintained the favor of these members of the republican faction for the duration of the Stadhouderless period, essentially the rest of his career.

### ***Quintus Fabius Maximus dismounts before his Son***

In 1656, soon after his return from Berlin, Lievens was called on for his first important commission in Amsterdam, one of the four chimneypieces for the chambers in the new Town Hall.<sup>539</sup> The Flemish-style painters Lievens, Jacob Jordaens and Govaert Flinck were the only painters of the *Oranjezaal* who also worked in the Amsterdam Town Hall, a measure of the growing popularity of their Flemish style in Amsterdam and

---

<sup>538</sup> The 1678 inventory of Erasmus II Quellinus included a landscape by Lievens. Schneider, 167.

<sup>539</sup> D.F. Slothouwer, *De Paleizen van Frederik Hendrik* (Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1945), 340.

of how continuously this style was associated with power.<sup>540</sup> Lievens's chimneypiece *Quintus Fabius Maximus* for the Burgomaster's Chamber was, like those by Govaert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol for other chambers, an *exemplum virtutis* (example of manly virtue) from Roman republican history. The other chimneypieces in the burgomaster's room, Govaert Flinck's *Marcus Curius Dentatus prefers Turnips to the Gifts of the Samnites* (Sum. 640, 1656) and Ferdinand Bol's *Pyrrus and Fabritius* (Sum. 100, 1656), showed two stories from the Roman republic intended to edify the civic leaders by emphasizing respectively the importance of incorruptibility and resoluteness.<sup>541</sup>

Valerius Maximus related the story of Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus (c.275-203 B.C.) in his *Nine Books of Memorable Deeds and Sayings*:

“Our ancestors maintained with the utmost care the custom that no man should interpose himself between a Consul and his Proximate Lictor, even through walking with the Consul in the course of duty... [Quintus Fabius Maximus] when sent by the senate as Legate to his son, the Consul, at Suessa, saw that he had come forth outside the town walls to pay his respects. Annoyed because none of the eleven lictors had told him to dismount from his horse he wrathfully kept his seat. Seeing this, his son ordered his Proximate Lictor to command his father to dismount and wait upon him. Fabius obeyed the order at once with the words; ‘My son, I did not flout your supreme authority, but I wished to take trial of whether you knew how to behave as a Consul. Neither am I unaware of the claims of respect due to a father, but I consider that public institutions take precedence over private duty.’”<sup>542</sup>

---

<sup>540</sup> Flinck's 1654 *The Mourning of Amalia van Solms* seems to have been painted for the Oranjezaal, but was only first inventoried in the Huis ten Bosch in 1667. J. W. Von Moltke, *Govaert Flinck 1615-1660* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1963), 39.

<sup>541</sup> Sumowski, *Gemälde III*, 1787.

<sup>542</sup> “Maxima autem diligentia maiores hunc morem retinuerunt, ne quis se inter consulem et proximum lictorem, quamvis officii causa una progredieretur, interponeret... [Quintus Fabius Maximus] a senatu legatus ad filium consulem Suessam missus, postquam animadvertit eum ad officium suum extra moenia oppidi processisse, indignatus quod ex undecim lictoribus nemo se equo descendere iussisset, plenus irae seder perseveravit. quod cum filius sensisset, proximo lictori ut <patrem iuberet ut ex equo descenderet et>

The rarely illustrated subject from the history of the Roman republic bore directly on the political situation in Holland in 1661.<sup>543</sup> Pro-Orange sympathy in Holland had been building since the office of Stadhouder was left empty after the premature death of Willem II in 1650, and had surged in 1652-3 but subsided after 1655.<sup>544</sup> The choice of subjects from the republican period of Roman history in itself indicated that the decoration of the Town Hall was intended to promote republican rule, asserting that elected or rotating office trumped inherited office, like that of Stadhouder.

As Houbraken noted, below Lievens's painting was a tablet inscribed by master calligrapher Lieven Coppinol with lines of verse by Joost van den Vondel,

“De Zoon van Fabius gebiet zyn eigen Vader  
Van't paard te stijgen, voor Stadts eer en achtbaarheid.  
Die kent geen bloet, en eischt dat hy eerbidig nader.  
Dus eert een man van staat, het ampt hem opgeleid.”<sup>545</sup>

---

sibi appareret imperavit. cuius voci continuo Fabius obsecutus ‘non ego’ inquit, ‘fili, summum imperium tuum contempsi, sed experiri volui an scires consulem agere: nec ignoro quid patriae venerationi debeatur, verum publica instituta privata pietate potiora iudico’ (Book II, ii, 4). Valerius Maximus, *Nine Books of Memorable Deeds and Sayings*, D.R. Shackleton Baily, ed., trans. (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 140-143. Fremantle, following Houbraken, read Suessa as the name of the consul whereas Bredius read it correctly as a place name (Bredius 477) just as Shackleton Bailey translated the word in Valerius Maximus's text. Katherine Fremantle, *The Baroque Town Hall of Amsterdam* (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1959), 67. Suessa Aurunca is the modern Sessa Aurunca in Campania. No person named Suesso or Suessa ever served as Roman consul.

<sup>543</sup> Pigler, 391. A painting formerly attributed to Rembrandt (Bredius 477, Sum. 1918, c. 1653 or 55, formerly Bucharest), was thought to show this subject and therefore thought to have been intended for the Town Hall, but it is unclear that it shows the story of Quintus Fabius Maximus.

<sup>544</sup> Israel, 719-722.

<sup>545</sup> Houbraken I, in Schneider, 302. Houbraken added in a note that “De Borgermeester Suesso gebood zyn eigen Vader G. Fabius Maximus, door den Raat van Romen als gezant aan hem gezonden, van't paart te stygen, door dien er een wet was, dat niemant te paart zittend een Borgermeester mocht naderen, om aan te spreken. De Vader gehoorzaamde dit bevel met eerbiet, en bewees zyn Zoon dien plicht welke hem als Borgermeester toekwam.” (The burgomaster Suesso orders his own father G. Fabius Maximus, sent to him as Ambassador from the Council of Rome, to dismount his horse, due to a law, that no one could approach the burgomaster to talk to him while sitting on a horse. The father obeys the order with respect, and brought the son the message he had come to bring as burgomaster.) Rembrandt etched his portrait of Coppinol around this time (Bartsch 282, 1657/8). Schwartz, 333.

(The son of Fabius bids his own Father to dismount from the horse for the State's honour and respect. It does not recognize blood relations and demands that he approach with obeisance. Thus a man of state honors the office that brought him up.")<sup>546</sup>

The Amsterdam poet and playwright Jan Vos also recognized the subject's republican spirit in his poem dedicated to the painting, "if respect deteriorates, then the power of cities deteriorates".<sup>547</sup> Below each one of the four chimneypiece paintings the respective hero was depicted again in a triumphant procession carved in low relief along the edge of the stone mantle. These reliefs reinforced his victorious and heroic character and emphasized his roots in classical antiquity, but also established the integral nature of the paintings to the décor and function of the rooms.<sup>548</sup>

In Lievens's painting the consul wears a wreath and stands at the right surrounded by soldiers at the top of the stairs. He raises his baton, commanding his father to dismount. His father approaches on foot with hand upturned in obeisance. Behind them a lictor holds the fasces, symbolic of the consul's republican authority. To the far left a diminutive African groom, perhaps symbolic of Q.F. Maximus's Carthaginian experiences, pulls back the reins to Maximus's powerful white horse, reinforcing the composition's theme of restraint and order. The moral of the story is that deference to the state trumps filial duty, even to an accomplished father.

---

<sup>546</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>547</sup> Jan Vos, *Alle de Gedichten* (1662), 526. "Op verscheide Schilderijen in de voornaamste Kamers van 't Stadhuis...In Burgemeesters Kamer; op Fabius Maximus, geschilderd door JL. De vader eert zijn zoon, op't opperste belast/wie hecht van't ampt gebruikt bewaart 's lands achbaarheid/All'ampten zijn beplicht aan't opper-overheeden zoo d'achtbaarheidt vervalt, vervalt de kracht der steeden."

<sup>548</sup> Fremantle, 68, figs. 69-72.



The state's primal authority is reiterated in the flag or standard that bears the motto of Rome, "S.P.Q.R." A mystified priestly figure at the right, with a face similar to Lievens's *tronien*, strokes his beard in contemplation, indicating the gravity and significance of the story. Although Valerius Maximus's story is set in an army camp, Lievens staged it in a Roman city to give it the kind of stage-like space appropriate to stately action. The stairs, building and many other structures are all round, and the doorway behind the consul is arched, giving the structures an oddly swelling and dynamic quality as well.

Lievens's 1639 Leiden commission *Continence of Scipio* for the *Vroedschapkamer* in Leiden's Town Hall must have been a determining factor in his being chosen to portray a work that had a comparable function in Amsterdam. Lievens executed *Quintus Fabius Maximus* in essentially the same highly classicising style and, in fact, only mildly altered his earlier arrangement of the main figures in *Scipio*. This arrangement would reappear in subsequent paintings such as *Christ and the Centurion* (1657) and *Brinio raised on a Shield* (1661) and thus came to be a standard or ideal for expressing a relationship of authority.

### ***Brinio raised on a Shield***

In 1659 Govaert Flinck had been awarded the large and prestigious project of completing the interior decoration of the new Town Hall with eight paintings from the story of the revolt of the Batavians to be installed in the lunettes of the gallery. His full-scale sketches were installed in time for a state visit that year, but Flinck died in 1660 and

the completion of only four of the lunettes were divided amongst his leading competitors: two went to Jordaens, one to Lievens, and the last to Rembrandt.<sup>549</sup> Lievens's *Brinio Raised on a Shield* showed the army of the Canninefates gathering for battle with the Romans in league with Claudius Civilis in 70 AD (Sum. 1213, 1661, fig. 168). The Caninefates were a Germanic tribe living in the area of Holland, and Tacitus described their preparation for the battle as follows:

“Among the Canninefates there was a certain Brinno, a man of a certain stolid bravery and of distinguished birth. His father, after venturing on many acts of hostility, had scorned with impunity the ridiculous expedition of Caligula. His very name, the name of a family of rebels, made him popular. Raised aloft on a shield after the national fashion, and balanced on the shoulders of the bearers, he was chosen general” (*History*, 4.15)<sup>550</sup>

Lievens shows Brinio in the middle ground at the center, hoisted above the army on a shield held up by soldiers. A knight in the foreground approaches Brinio to salute him as the new leader and accept his authority, in an arrangement formally identical to Lievens's *Quintus Fabius Maximus*.

The narrative clarity, monumental sweep, and central placement of Brinio in Lievens's composition contrasted sharply with Govaert Flinck's original design drawing, which survives (c. 1659, Hamburg, fig. 170).<sup>551</sup> Lievens made Brinio central, in contrast

---

<sup>549</sup> Margaret Deutsch Carroll, “Civic Ideology and its Subversion: Rembrandt's *Oath of Claudius Civilis*,” *Art History* 9 (1986): 15-17.

<sup>550</sup> *The Complete works of Tacitus*, trans Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb (New York: Modern Library, 1942), 602. “erat in Canninefatibus stolidae audaciae Brinno, claritate natalium insigni; pater eius multa hostilia ausas Gaianarum expeditionum ludibrium impune spreverat. igitur ipso rebellis familiae nomine placuit impositusque scuto more gentis et sustinentium umeris vibratus dux deligitur.” Cornelius Tacitus, *Historiae*, Charles Dennis Fisher, trans. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911) [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) (Accessed January 19, 2006).

<sup>551</sup> Moltke, Nr. D. 35. The surviving drawing most likely reflected the full-size cartoon installed in place in

to Flinck, who showed the shield-raising ceremony off to the left. A group of soldiers in the foreground seem oblivious to the action. Lievens employed a twist on his familiar arrangement, since the foreground figure, unlike the centurion and Quintus Fabius Maximus in their respective compositions, is not mentioned in the narrative, and neither is the banner beside him. This shift of emphasis signals that Lievens had modified his standard arrangement in order to adapt to it the composition of another well-known work of art, which was a common strategy in Lievens's work. In this case he adapted a composition by Rembrandt, who had been, after all, a presence in Amsterdam's art world since the early 1630s.

There are several indicators that the two had renewed their friendship around this time. Several of Lievens's Antwerp-period paintings were listed among Rembrandt's goods in 1657, indicating that he resumed contact or friendship with Lievens when the latter lived in Amsterdam before 1653. They had many patrician clients in common such as the Trips, Andries de Graaf and Joan de Huydecoper. Moreover, Lievens made a black chalk portrait drawing of Rembrandt (Sum. D 1756xx, c. 1661, Leiden, fig. 171) that marks their encounter.<sup>552</sup> They did not, however, work in the Town Hall together because Lievens's painting was installed before January 13, 1661 whereas Rembrandt had not even produced his first design (Benesch 1061, late 1661, Munich, fig. 172) for his 1662 *Oath of Claudius Civilis* (Bredius 482, 1662, Stockholm) before October 25, 1661.<sup>553</sup>

---

1659 but which does not survive. J. W. von Moltke, *Govaert Flinck*, 42, 178.

<sup>552</sup> Sumowski, *Drawings* VII, 3902.

<sup>553</sup> Lievens was paid 1200 guilders for his painting. Bredius I, 199-200. Rembrandt's painting was only installed in August 1662, having been designed on the back of an invitation dated to October 25 of the previous year, 1661. Schwartz, 320.

Lievens marked his admiration for Rembrandt in a way that was typical for him: through skillfully and seamlessly adapting Rembrandt's work to a new subject. The knight and banner in *Brinio raised on a Shield*, when paired with the elevated figure of Brinio himself, transform the entire composition into a striking formal imitation of one of Rembrandt's greatest works, the fourth and last state of the 1653 etching *Three Crosses* (Bartsch 78 iv/iv, c. 1660-61, fig. 169).<sup>554</sup> These elements were present in the first sketch for *Brinio* (Sum. 1212, c. 1660, Amsterdam). Not only do the position and gesture of the knight match those of Rembrandt's figure of Longinus (newly prominent in the fourth state), but the cross bar of the second cross in Rembrandt's print has been transformed into a banner whose angle it matches. The bright halo-like area of light around Brinio in a stormy atmosphere matches the one around Rembrandt's Christ in the darkness at noon. This kind of concealed emulation was recommended by Angel and carried with it a tone of admiration that, according to Quintillian's principles of rhetoric.

The success of Lievens's *Brinio* was due partly to his Flemish style so valued by his patrons, and the basic classicist arrangement and powerful composition he employed. Lievens showed Brinio from below, exploited the high position of the final work to make Brinio seem even grander, and make his work far more effective in this kind of placement than those by Jordaens. His transformations of Rembrandt's composition form a clear and unmistakable gesture of admiration to his friend, but are so entirely and successfully subsumed in the baroque scheme and triumphant splendor of the painting as to have escaped notice until now. Only by means of an informed awareness of Lievens's habits of assimilation and adaptation do they become apparent.

---

<sup>554</sup> *Rembrandt Experimental Etcher*, exh. cat. (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1969), 86.

Brinio points his sword forward, as signal of the coming battle and a gesture that reflects a similar signal to advance given by Frans Banning Cocq in Rembrandt's *Nightwatch* (Bredius 410, 1642, Amsterdam). Rembrandt's masterpiece also seems to have inspired Lievens's unprecedented inclusion of much more lively anecdotal detail of battle preparation than Govaert Flinck did in his 1659 design or Otto Van Veen in his c.1612-13 painting of Brinio (after Antonio Tempesta). Lievens shows soldiers' activities ranging from picking up armor and bidding family farewell to beating drums, a detail that also fixed the moment of the scene as the mustering for combat. These elements correspond to those in the *Nightwatch*, suggesting another layer of reference to Rembrandt in Lievens's *Brinio*.

Lievens retained the heavy impasto and loose atmospheric paint handling of his Antwerp period, especially visible in his landscapes, and this dominates Lievens's first sketch for *Brinio* (Sum. 1212, c.1660, Amsterdam). As Samuel van Hoogstraten wrote, "In't aengesmeerde verwen, vernissen en olyen wonderen te zoeken, was Jan Lievens dapper t'huis" ("in the search for wonders in smeared-on paints, varnishes and oils, Jan Lievens was heartily at home").<sup>555</sup> Years later, Gerard de Lairesse would concur, commenting that [Rembrandt's and] Lievens's paint ran down their canvases "like dung."<sup>556</sup> However consistent with Lievens's predilection for dark painting and atmospheric effects his *Brinio* may have been, in this case Lievens was paying attention to the other paintings in the Town Hall, specifically the ones already installed by

---

<sup>555</sup> Hoogstraten, *Inleyding*, in Schneider, 300. Ernst van de Wetering, "The Symbiosis of Lievens and Rembrandt," *Jan Lievens, The Sacrifice of Isaac*, exh. cat. (1991, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Museum of Art, 1999), 20.

<sup>556</sup> Ernst van de Wetering, in *Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*, 53.

Jordaens, which both depicted nocturnal scenes. Thus the dusky light in Lievens's painting is consistent both with the subject assigned and the other scenes in the Town Hall gallery lunettes.

The political message the burgomasters were projecting through the paintings by Lievens, Rembrandt and Jordaens has not always been clearly understood.<sup>557</sup> As Margaret Carroll has shown, the paintings that were finally installed in the lunettes by 1661 do not retain the pro-Orangist message of the 1659 set of full-scale sketches that were hastily finished by Govaert Flinck and installed in time for the meeting of Orange family women in Amsterdam, or of Otto van Veen's c. 1612-13 paintings of the story of Claudius Civilis given to the States-General (Amsterdam).<sup>558</sup> Carroll argues that by replacing Flinck's pro-Orange cartoons with a series of four lunettes showing mainly ceremonies and negotiations, the city fathers undercut the analogy between the Dutch Revolt and that of the Batavians, and loosened the connection traditionally made between William of Orange and Claudius Civilis, instead emphasizing patriotism and peace.<sup>559</sup> The State Pensionary Jacob Cats (1577-1660) cited the example of the ancient Hebrews in arguing for the abolition the hereditary captaincy-general, since they were thought to have elected a general on the eve of each battle, an explicit parallel to the story of

---

<sup>557</sup> Albert Blankert, *Kunst als regeringszaak in Amsterdam in de 17e eeuw*, exh. cat. (Lochem: De Tijdstroom, 1975), 27-29.

<sup>558</sup> Flinck's designs continue to reflect the intended pro-Orange sentiment of the country in reaction to Holland's secret Act of Seclusion of 1651, a treaty with England to ensure Cromwell that no Orange would ever again command Holland's armies. It was not until the 1662 Treaty of Navigation with England that Amsterdam once again reverted to an openly Anti-Orangeist policy, but the policy shift is anticipated by the paintings. Carroll, 15. Bob Haak, *The Golden Age*, E. Willems-Treeman, trans. (New York: Abrams, 1984), 49, 50.

<sup>559</sup> Carroll, 16.

Lievens's *Brinio*.<sup>560</sup>

Otto Van Veen had showed *Brinio* as a crudely dressed, swaggering barbarian (1612-1613, Amsterdam), Flinck as an armored knight. Lievens made the connection to the present and recent past explicit by dressing *Brinio* as a patrician civic guard commander complete with sash, sword and plumed hat. His men wear either armor or the archaic Burgundian slashed-sleeve costumes of the time of the revolt, emphasizing the sense of historic continuity in the struggle for freedom. That struggle allegorized in the story of *Brinio* had culminated in the 1648 Treaty of Münster, an event closely linked to the building of the Town Hall, which began the same year. By adapting to the artistic and shifting political requirements of his commission with skill and deference, Lievens's *Brinio* marks what would be a high point in his career and a remarkable late personal tribute to Rembrandt.

### ***Christ and the Centurion 1657***

Lievens's *Christ and the Centurion* (Sum. 2356, 86 x 69 cm, Private Collection, fig. 167) marks a point in his development between the two paintings he executed for Amsterdam's Town Hall. In this rare late religious painting, Lievens depicted a story that was exceptional in Dutch art (Matt. 8: 5-13).<sup>561</sup> Surrounded by his disciples, Christ stands to the right and is approached by the centurion who kneels in the left foreground,

---

<sup>560</sup> Gregor J. M. Weber, "Jan Lievens's 'The Shield-raising of Brinio' a Second Oil Sketch," *Hoogsteder-Naumann Mercury* 12/13 (1992): 49.

<sup>561</sup> In the handful of examples are those by Moyaert (1629, Herenthals) and Breenburgh (1637, Karlsruhe). Pigler, 278.

essentially the same arrangement as seen in *Quintus Fabius Maximus*. The centurion came to petition Christ to heal his paralyzed servant. He believed that Christ did not need to do anything or even come to the servant, but had merely to command the miracle just as the centurion himself commanded men: “I say to one ‘Go’ and he goes, and to another ‘Come’ and he comes” to which Christ responded “Truly, I say to you, not even in Israel have I found such faith....Go; be it done for you as you have believed.” As a Roman and not a Jew, the centurion was outside of the traditional boundaries of the covenant people of Israel.

Instead of confining himself to these boundaries, Jesus responded positively to the centurion because of the man’s faith in Jesus’s ability to heal the stricken. Although the story had the potential to illustrate the Protestant doctrine of salvation by faith alone, the classicist composition obscures this by instead emphasizing how Romans were brought into the people of the new covenant, the Church, which replaced Israel, the people of old covenant. Considering that Lievens probably remained a Catholic after 1644, this latter interpretation was likely the intended one. The unusual subject, the arched top (indicating an architectural installation), and the large scale of what seems to be a sketch indicate that *Christ and the Centurion* was a design for a larger commissioned work.<sup>562</sup> Lievens employed the kind of formal arrangement seen in *Quintus Fabius Maximus* and *The Contenance of Scipio*. Christ is cast as a powerful leader granting clemency, which considerably diminishes the spiritual impact and the qualities of empathy and mercy, especially when compared to Lievens’s early *Raising of Lazarus*.

X-radiology of this painting shows that during its execution Lievens lowered the

---

<sup>562</sup> Pigler, 277, 278. Paul Huys Janssen, *The Hoogsteder Exhibition of Rembrandt’s Academy* (The Hague: Hoogsteder and Hoogsteder, 1992), 222.



figure of Christ and reduced its size. He began with an arrangement close to that of his 1656 *Maximus* and moved to one with a stronger spatial recession and the dramatic sweep upward very much like the 1660 *Brinio*.<sup>563</sup> He changed it from a frieze-like arrangement similar to *The Five Muses* (1650) and *Diana at the Hunt* (1654) to a more monumental and dramatic vertical one. The stately spruce and oak trees take on more prominence as a result.<sup>564</sup> This work shows not only his development towards a grander formula for staging scenes from history but more importantly how formal Lievens's approach to composition had become during his mature period.

### ***Mars, 1663-1664***

The 3.4 meter tall *Mars* (Sum. 1247, 1664, The Hague, fig. 173 ) is Lievens's tallest surviving work and the most prominently placed. Installed on the end wall, *Mars* dominates the *Statenzaal* in The Hague. Brandishing a massive sword towards the viewer, Lievens's *Mars* stands on a rampart that overlooks a burning city behind him. He tramples musical instruments, coins, jewels, armor, an open book with "PRIVILEGIA" (privileges) written on its pages, and one which is entitled "BIBLIA" (religion). A comet, as omen of disaster, streaks through the sky overhead while the eagle on one of the banners to the right probably refers to Spanish brutality. The gigantic, tilting figure *Mars* makes the composition seem unstable. Locked into the framework of the architect Pieter Post's classicising *Statenzaal*, however, it gained an expansive energy.

---

<sup>563</sup> Huys Janssen, 223.

<sup>564</sup> The spruce trees in the background betray the influence of the Scandinavian landscapes of Allaert van Everdingen (1621-1675, brother of Cesar), who lived in Amsterdam. Huys Janssen, 223, 226.

The new meeting hall of the most powerful assembly in the United Provinces was first conceived in 1651. Johan De Witt was Pensionary of Dordrecht at the time and would later become pensionary of Holland from 1653 until 1672.<sup>565</sup> With the Stadhouderate vacant, he sought to build a new and fitting meeting chamber for the States of Holland by taking up part of the unoccupied Stadhouder's quarters in the Binnenhof.<sup>566</sup> After 1650 the States of Holland held unchecked power, controlled a global empire and sought a meeting room in a classicising style that suited their status more appropriately than the medieval *Ridderzaal*, the emblem of the power of the Oranges and all the prior Counts of Holland.<sup>567</sup> The architect Pieter Post had built the Huis ten Bosch and thus had worked with Lievens as well as Adriaen Hanneman of The Hague, among the closest followers of Van Dyck available. Hanneman's *Peace* was installed on the wall opposite Lievens's *Mars*.<sup>568</sup>

Lievens had lived in The Hague from 1655-58, and after moving to Amsterdam had maintained a non-resident's membership in the painter's confraternity *Pictura* (of which he had been a founding member in 1656) from 1660 to 1661. Little is known about the orphan Erick van Weerelt's period of study with Lievens that began in 1662, but Lievens clearly would have needed some assistance with the huge *Mars*, begun in

---

<sup>565</sup> The balcony which obscures much of the lower part of the figure was installed in 1881 and was modified in the recent restoration to allow visual access to the entire surface of the painting.

<sup>566</sup> K. A. Ottenheim, "De Zaal van de Staten van Holland," *Eerste Kamer: Reflecties over de Vergaderzaal van de "Chambre de Réflexion"* (The Hague: SDU Uitgeverij, 1994), 21.

<sup>567</sup> The "Edel Groot Mogende Heeren" retained Pieter Post, the architect of the Huis ten Bosch, to design a new *Statenzaal* in 1652. Both Post's classicising architectural vocabulary and the painted decoration of the chamber forcefully projected republican power at a moment in Dutch history when monarchical pressures were rebuilding from within the republic and from without, especially after the monarchy was restored in England. R.J. van Pelt and M. E. Tiethoff-Spliethoff, *Het Binnenhof van Grafelijk Residentie tot Regeringscentrum* (Dieren: Bataafsche Leeuw, 1984), 85.

<sup>568</sup> Buijsen, 193.

1663.<sup>569</sup> The commission for *Mars* was discussed in correspondence between the State Pensionary Johan De Witt and Lievens, and in letters between De Witt and his brother-in-law, the Amsterdam patrician Pieter de Graaf, concerning a portrait commission of their mother-in-law. Pieter was also the brother of Lievens's Amsterdam patron Andries de Graeff.

In a letter of April 24, 1663 to Johan de Witt, Lievens mentions that he had left a sketch for *Mars* (Sch. 86a, lost) with the "Heere van Wimmenom" for approval.<sup>570</sup> He wrote: "Ick wenst wel dat ick het genoeg hadt aengetroffen want ick seer grote lust heb om wat ongemeens daer in te weech te brengen, also den oorloch een schilderachtich susiëtt is." ("I hope I have met with approval because I have a great desire to stir up something extraordinary in it, because War is a picturesque subject.")<sup>571</sup> Lievens's use of the word "schilderachtig" to refer to war and his gigantic and heinous figure of *Mars* as a subject are consistent with how the term was used at the time. When the artist and theorist Jan de Bisschop noted disapprovingly in his *Icones and Paradigmata* (1668-1671) that what people thought was *schilderachtig* was "almost everything that was objectionable to the eye," he too indicated that it meant a kind of artistic ugliness.<sup>572</sup>

---

<sup>569</sup> Schneider, 277.

<sup>570</sup> De Witt gave Lievens's address as the Hartestraat in Amsterdam, on the other side of the Town Hall from the Nieuwmarkt where he had been living in 1654. Schneider, 296.

<sup>571</sup> Boudewijn Bakker, "Schilderachtig: discussions of a seventeenth-century term and concept," *Simiolus* 23 (1995): 157. In a second letter to Johan de Witt concerning the *Mars* commission of May 8, 1664, Lievens asks for payment before finishing the hands and landscape, since he was behind on his rent. He had delegated his brother to pick up the sketch from Bouchorst, so that he could proceed. Schneider, 298, 299. This brother must have been Titus, Lievens's only brother who survived past 1661, and who lived in The Hague his entire life. De Baar, 16.

<sup>572</sup> De Bisschop urged a shift towards an understanding that was closer to the idea of beauty or classical perfection. In his early *tronien*, Lievens must have embodied the opposite of de Bisschop's classical ideal, for he did prefer "a misformed, old, wrinkled person rather than a well-formed, fresh and youthful one" in many of those works. Bakker, 157.

Lievens's *Mars* is not the product of his indiscriminating realism but rather a caricature not unlike Lievens's figure of a bound and writhing Mars lying on the ground in his 1652 *Triumph of Peace*. Lievens adapted the restively triumphant figure of Mars from an unexpected source: Pieter Serwouter's 1614 print after David Vinckboons's *The Christian Knight* (fig. 174). Mars is nearly identical to the knight, but has a very different meaning. Lievens may have known the print from Lastman's studio or from Counter-Remonstrant circles in Leiden.<sup>573</sup> This kind of concealed borrowing and transformation of elements from the works of others was exactly the kind of imitation Angel recommended and the kind highly regarded by Quintillian.

Although the letters between Lievens and De Witt mention only "den oorloch," another work by Lievens, *Arithmetic and Measurement* (Sch. 114, c. 1664, lost), was installed around this time as a mantelpiece in the hall of the Gecommitteerde Raden, which was the space directly below the *Statenzaal*.<sup>574</sup> Lievens's painting remained in place until the 1913 renovation of the lower hall, after which it went missing, its composition unrecorded. It was an allegory of the two arts that were most important to the Gecommitteerde Raden and their task of building and maintaining public works.<sup>575</sup> The composition of the missing painting is likely reflected to some degree in another mantelpiece painting made around the same time, *The Mathematician* (Sum. 1248, 1666, Leiden), painted for essentially the same client: the "Heer van Wimmenom," Amelis van Bouchorst, the *voorzitter* or chairman of the Raden.

---

<sup>573</sup> Schwartz, 31.

<sup>574</sup> This painting was reportedly covered during the 1913 renovation of the hall to accommodate the *Waterstaat* ministry. Schneider, 120.

<sup>575</sup> Schneider, 119, 120.

In *Mars* Lievens indeed created something “schilderachtig” and uncommon, which was consistent with his early artistic ambitions. It brings to mind Huygens’s c. 1629 admiring comments about Lievens’s audacious forms and inventiveness, and the over-life size figure scale of Lievens’s early works. These are the qualities that make *Mars* especially effective in the context of the *Statenzaal*.<sup>576</sup> Lievens had refined the figure of *Mars* through several previous works and adapted it to the unique demands and conditions of the *Statenzaal* commission.

### **Paintings for the Hoogheemraadschap Rijnland**

Among his many functions, Amelis van Bouchorst was also dike-reeve of the water authority Hoogheemraadschap Rijnland, whose meeting place, the Rijnlandshuis, was located in Leiden.<sup>577</sup> He was Lievens’s last major civic patron, commissioning two paintings for the Rijnlandshuis as well as works for his home before he died in 1669. In September 1666, Lievens delivered to the Hoogheemraadschap “een matematicus gemaect bij mijn soon van mijn geordonneert en op veel plasen over schildert” for “...de schou in de slaepkamer van de heer van Wimmenum.” (“...a mathematician made by my son, composed and overpainted by me in many places” for “the chimney in the bedroom of the Lord of Wimmenum”) (Sum. 1248, Leiden).<sup>578</sup>

---

<sup>576</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 132.

<sup>577</sup> Buijsen, 193. K. A. Ottenheym, 23.

<sup>578</sup> S. B. van Raay, et al, *Tot hun contentement gemaect, het kunstbezit van het Hoogheemraadschap van*

The painting (fig. 175) shows a bearded scholar dressed in a sumptuous silk robe and fur professor's hat, seated at a table.<sup>579</sup> He holds a compass in one hand, while in the other he holds up an astronomical ring dial.<sup>580</sup> On the table are various other measuring devices and the plan for a fortification, while in the background a celestial globe sits on a table under a drapery. A cross-staff (or Jacob's staff), used for measuring the elevation of the sun, lies against the window.<sup>581</sup> The *Mathematician* celebrated the art of surveying and ordering the landscape, and like the *Arithmetic and Measurement* that Lievens made for the hall of the Gecommitteerde Raden in The Hague, it was a secular allegory that raised the activities of these bodies to the level of the heroic. Lievens transformed his early generic type of the scholar, such as the *Quill Cutter* (Sum. 1235, c. 1627, formerly Kreuzlingen), or an evangelist such as *St. Mark* (Sum. 1231, 1626/7, Bamberg) into a new type of secular allegorical figure, its grave tenor enhanced by the atmospheric and painterly Flemish style he brought to bear.<sup>582</sup>

---

*Rijnland* (Leiden: De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1987), 74-75. Bouchorst also commissioned a number of works from Lievens including an allegory of Hope, listed in his inventory of 1669. Lievens petitioned his widow on October 14, 1669 for payment for the works in the amount of 1300 guilders. Notaris P. van Roon, The Hague. Protocollen, in Bredius I, 207-208. Apparently Bouchorst's chamber in the Rijnlandshuis also had a bed.

<sup>579</sup> Bouchorst was also "curator" of the university since 1643, but as W.P. Spies argues, the figure portrayed is most likely not Bouchorst himself in the guise of a scholar but rather the kind of anonymous figure typical of an allegory. No portrait of the powerful Bouchorst survives by which to compare the face. *Tot hun contentement gemaect*, 75.

<sup>580</sup> *Tot hun contentement gemaect*, 75.

<sup>581</sup> The authors of *Tot hun contentement gemaect* identify the cross-staff in the window as a "protractor." *Tot hun contentement gemaect*, 75. The plans for a fortress and measuring tools occur in Ripa's Allegory of Architecture, but the scholar and the globe do not. Ripa, 24.

<sup>582</sup> Although Lievens mentioned that he himself composed and finished the *Mathematician*, he noted that it was painted by his son, the first mention of the artistic activity of the 22-year-old Jan Andrea, Lievens's son by Susana Colijns de Nole. Jan Andrea was trained by his father and worked in his style. Considerable conflict must have erupted between father and son over the course of the year 1666. According to records noted by Bredius but not currently retrievable, Jan petitioned the magistracy of Amsterdam to arrest and discipline his son Jan Andrea, as he was no longer able to control him. He complains that Jan Andrea had

The second painting commissioned from Lievens was for the chimney of the Grote Kamer in the Rijnlandshuis (Sch. 112, Leiden, fig. 176), which in 1669 served as Chamber of Justice.<sup>583</sup> In his invoice of February 28, 1669, Lievens describes the painting as “den tijt korpus Juris aan Justitia is brengende die geacompanieert is met de godinne Pallas”<sup>584</sup> (Time bringing the Corpus Juris to Justice who is accompanied by the goddess Athena), a subject appropriate to such a chamber. Although the painter Carel de Moor claimed to have entirely covered the original painting during his restoration of 1699, Lievens’s original composition (according to the description in the invoice) has been preserved and Lievens’s somber and monumental style can be distinguished, also in details such as the tronie-like head of Time, the classicising profile of Justice and the brooding sky.<sup>585</sup> The scythe-carrying Saturnian winged figure of Time delivers to the figure of Justice a copy of the 1652 edition of the *Corpus Juris Civilis* published in Lyon. Justice is enthroned and holds her typical attributes, scales and a sword but is not blindfolded.<sup>586</sup> She is flanked by Minerva holding her Medusa shield and a spear, her

---

run away from home and become engaged to a certain Annetien, of minor age, also against the wishes of her parents. She lived across the street in the Hartestraat and Jan Andrea would spend day and night there, putting the neighborhood in uproar. He also threatened and harmed his siblings. Jan petitioned the city to lock up his oldest son until he had an opportunity to send him out of the country. Bredius cited the “Conceptions for Requests” of the notary H. Westfrisius, with a question mark added. No notice of that or any kind by Lievens is found in the records of Westfrisius or of any of the other notaries Lievens used who were active in Amsterdam that year. Bredius, 203-204. Schneider, 279-283. Jan Andrea Lievens’s works include *Engel de Ruyter* (c. 1668, Amsterdam) and its pendant *Jan van Gelder* (1668, Amsterdam) as well as *Hagar in the Desert* (1669, location unknown) and *Equestrian Portrait of Dirck Decker in the Dunes* (1671), Cambridge. Jan Verkolje was Jan Andrea Lievens’s student. Schneider, 279-283. S. J. Gudlaugsson, “Jan Andrea Lievens als Schilder van Ruitersportretten,” *Oud Holland* LXV (1950): 123.

<sup>583</sup> *Tot hun contentement gemaect*, 69.

<sup>584</sup> *Tot hun contentement gemaect*, 70.

<sup>585</sup> *Tot hun contentement gemaect*, 73. Schneider, 118.

<sup>586</sup> The volume of *Corpus Juris Civilis* shown was published by Philippe Borde, Laurent Arnaud and Claude Rigaud and printed in Lyon, rather than Leiden as assumed by some. *Tot hun contentement*, 71-72. Ripa, 120.

owl perched on a short wall in the background.

In his *Inleyding tot de Hooge Schoole der Schilderkonst* (1678), Samuel van Hoogstraeten relates an anecdote that seems to refer to this painting:

“Onzen Livius had laetst in een stuck de waerheit uitgebeelt, daerze van de gerechticheit gekroont wiert, hij had ‘er ook een gryzaert als de tijd bygevoegt, gelijk het onderwerp scheen te vereyschen; maer een der aenbesteeders gaf voor, dat dien ouden vent daer niet paste. Waer over den Schilder hem en eenige andere beelden, die toch niet opgemaekt waren, uitstreek, ontlastende zich zelve van geen kleinen arbeit, en prees den vernuftigen raetsman.”<sup>587</sup>

(“Our Livius recently made a work that represented the Truth, where she is being crowned by Justice, he also added an old man as Time, which the subject seemed to call for, but one of the patrons mentioned that the old fellow did not fit. The painter unrolled for him some other figures over top of it that were not complete anyway, unburdening himself of no small amount of labor, and praised the clever councilman.”)<sup>588</sup>

This story reveals not only that Lievens used *tronien* as actual (unfinished) stock figures kept in the workshop and placed in paintings, but it also illustrates how Lievens adapted to the demands of his patrons.<sup>589</sup>

Lievens painted an allegory of *Hope* (Sch. 112, lost) for Bouchorst in 1669, which

---

<sup>587</sup> Hoogstraten, in Schneider, 300-301.

<sup>588</sup> Translaton mine.

<sup>589</sup> *Tot hun contentement gemaect*, 70. Hoogstraten’s description generally follows what is visible in the Rijnlandshuis composition, and the discrepancies could be due to the fact that the painting was very dark and that the event occurred at least nine years in the past. He noted that the event happened recently, which, since Lievens produced no major work after 1671, must refer to a late work by Lievens. He also refers accurately to the patron as a “raetsman” or councilman, which would also be consistent with Bouchorst’s position. The typical scale of Lievens’s *tronie* heads would indicate that Hoogstraten refers to a finished work rather than the sketch for *Justice receiving the Corpus Juris from Time* (Sch. 112, lost). Although Schneider catalogues the painting that Hoogstraten discusses as Nr. 111, separately from the sketch for *Justice* that Lievens refers to in his invoice of 1669 (Sch. 112), I would argue they are one and the same. Hoogstraten, in Schneider, 300-301.



was installed in the bedroom of his home. Unfortunately for Lievens, Bouchorst, who would be his last major patron, passed away that year. His personal liabilities to Lievens amounted to 1900 guilders.<sup>590</sup> By December, 1671 Lievens's situation was dramatically changed and he was desperately trying to postpone the seizure of his goods in The Hague, a circumstance brought about by unpaid rent.<sup>591</sup>

### **Lievens's portraiture in Amsterdam**

Although Lievens had painted virtually no portraits in Antwerp besides that of Egidius de Morrillon (Sum. 1288, 1637, Budapest), Lievens's reputation in Holland was that of a court portraitist because he had reputedly painted portraits of Charles I and his family. In Antwerp and Leiden he had drawn and published some prints of his familiar and most obliging associates, but soon after he arrived in Amsterdam in 1644 he was engaged as a portraitist by members of the patrician and elite circles. His sitters included Adriaan Trip (Sum. 1290, 1644, Private Collection), Anna Maria van Schurman (1607-1678) (Sum. 1291, 1649, London, fig. 179), Sir Robert Kerr (Sum. 1294, 1654, Edinburgh) and Jacob Junius (1607-1671) (Sum. 1295, c. 1655, Milwaukee, fig. 181).<sup>592</sup> He also produced his most splendid self-portrait (Sum. 1289, c. 1650, London, fig. 177). With their languorous brushwork and the light painterly touch, these are Lievens's most

---

<sup>590</sup> Schneider, 118. Bredius I, 208.

<sup>591</sup> Bredius IV, 141.

<sup>592</sup> Jacob Junius made his fortune as a trader in Mazulipatnam in India. Iconographisch Bureau (The Hague), April 6, 1973 letter to Bert van Deun. My kind thanks to Alfred Bader for sharing this information.

Van Dyckian portraits. The figures, somber, formal and dignified in these portraits, emerge from dark backgrounds into a soft light.

Lievens's output as a portraitist during his last thirty years was considerable, and most of it consisted of prints and drawings. His range of sitters for these, from René Descartes to Andries de Graeff, also represented a cross-section of the most prestigious and powerful figures of his day. He developed his work by consciously adapting and assimilating important models and poses, in some cases even well-known Renaissance portraits including Titian's "*Ariosto*." Not only did he portray his subjects with peculiar acuity and expressive facility, it is clear from the portraits that his rapport with the sitter became a factor in the making of the portrait. He seems to have made no attempt to conceal his self-confidence in his portraits (or to his sitters) or in the few self-portraits of his later years.

### ***London Self-Portrait and Krakow Portrait of a Young Man***

Around the time of his Oranjezaal commission, Lievens made his grandest self-portrait (Sum. 1289, c. 1650, London, fig. 177), which serves as a summary of his ambition, style and achievement at that time.<sup>593</sup> Lievens shows himself dressed in a puffy-sleeved cloak (gold-colored once again) over an open blouse fashionable beginning

---

<sup>593</sup> Christopher Brown noted that the "negligée" style of dress dated it to the 1650s, not the late 1630s as Schneider and Sumowski stated. Christopher Brown, review of Braunschweig Exhibition, *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 745. Schneider, 47-48. Sumowski, *Gemälde* III, 1809. The identity and date of this portrait are confirmed by comparison to a later drawn self-portrait of around 1660 (Sum. D. 1615, Vienna). See also Gutbrod, 186 n 9. Sumowski, *Drawings* VII, 2598. Wrinkles and sagging skin appear on the face of the c. 45-year-old Lievens upon close inspection, despite his efforts to mitigate the appearance of age. In his drawn portrait of Rembrandt of c. 1660 (Sum 1756xx, Leiden Prentenkabinet der Rijksuniversiteit AW 1), Lievens makes him appear younger than he appears in Rembrandt's Kenwood House *Self-Portrait* (Bredius 52, 1661, London).

around 1650.<sup>594</sup> Lievens assumes a tightly controlled facial expression and slightly averted gaze reminiscent of the Edinburgh *Self-Portrait in a Yellow Cloak* (Sum. 1264, c. 1631, fig. 33). He projects an elegant informality by slinging his right arm over the side of the chair; the hand elegantly touches the armrest. At the same time Lievens counters this gesture by assertively jutting the elbow of his other arm.

For this portrait Lievens slightly modified the pose of Titian's "*Ariosto*" (c. 1510, London, fig. 182), a painting that was in the Lopez Collection in Amsterdam until 1641.<sup>595</sup> In Lievens's *Self-Portrait* one senses that the self-confidence and "loftiness" Huygens mentioned was a firmly entrenched part of his public persona.<sup>596</sup> Lievens's only self-portrait drawing (Sum. D. 1615, c. 1660, Vienna, fig. 183) shows him around the time of the *Brinio* commission, leaning over the back of his chair, wearing a skullcap and holding a maulstick and brushes, and exuding the same self-confidence as in the London *Self-Portrait*.<sup>597</sup>

The costume, pose and background of the London *Self-Portrait* are echoed in Lievens's splendid *Portrait of a Young Man* of c. 1660-65 (Sum.1298, Krakow, fig. 184). Lievens once again modeled his portrait on that of a famous Italian Renaissance portrait, in this case Raphael's *Portrait of Young Man* (c. 1515, formerly Krakow, fig. 185),<sup>598</sup>

---

<sup>594</sup> Brown, review of Braunschweig Exhibition, *Jan Lievens*, 745. See comparable examples by Nicolaes Maes in Pasadena (Sum 1414, c. 1675) and Braunschweig, (Sum. 1398, 1660-65) as well as Lievens's *Portrait of a Young Man* now in Krakow of c. 1660-65 (Sum. 1298).

<sup>595</sup> This portrait was copied by Rembrandt and then used as the basis of the composition of his *Self-Portrait* of 1640 (London). Schwartz, 214.

<sup>596</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 132.

<sup>597</sup> This drawing recalls Rembrandt's *Self-portrait* (Bredius 52, c. 1660, London) in which he also holds a palette and maulstick.

<sup>598</sup> *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 115.

which Lievens could have known either through Anthony van Dyck's 1622 sketch (Chatsworth) or more likely through Pontius's reproduction engraving of 1625 after the original.<sup>599</sup> The thin gauzy fabric of the costume in Lievens's portrait is close in style to the fabric worn by the figure in Lievens's 1666 *Mathematician* (Sum. 1248, Leiden, fig. 175), indicating a date substantially later, between 1660 and 1665, than the *Self-Portrait* (c. 1650). The landscape background confirms a date in the mid-1660s as well, as the oak trees resemble those in the late *Landscape with Hagar and the Angel* (Sum. 1310, c. 1660, Rouen, fig. 196). No less than the history paintings, the splendor and bravura of these two portraits, with their allusions to Renaissance models, exemplify Lievens's self-confidence, ambition and capacity for assimilation.

### ***Adriaan Trip and other Amsterdam sitters for paintings***

Upon his arrival in Amsterdam Lievens received a major portrait commission from Adriaan Trip (Sum 1290, 1644, Private Collection, fig. 178) the year before Trip's marriage to Adriane de Geer.<sup>600</sup> In 1639 Rembrandt had painted Adriaan Trip's sister Maria de Geer (Bredius 356, Amsterdam) and her mother Alijdt (Bredius 355, 1639, Rotterdam).<sup>601</sup> The Van Dyckian style of Lievens's portrait is very different from those portraits of Trip family members by Rembrandt. Adriaan Trip's pose is elegant and artificial; he turns to the viewer but stands in profile. While clutching gloves casually

---

<sup>599</sup> Jan Lievens, *ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*, 117 n. 5, 6. Laurie Winters et al, *Leonardo da Vinci and the Splendor of Poland*, exh. cat. (Mikwaukee: Museum of Fine Arts, 2002), Nr. 45.

<sup>600</sup> Adriaan Trip was a merchant at Norrkoeping in Sweden, and married Adriane de Geer, daughter of Louys de Geer and Adriane Gard. [www.beernink.com](http://www.beernink.com) (Accessed August 22, 2005).

<sup>601</sup> Schwartz, 206-207.

behind his back, he thrusts his elbow directly towards the viewer. The slightly lowered point-of-view, diffuse light, amorphous background and powerful stance of the sitter generate a solemnity consistent with Lievens's earlier Van Dyckian portraits.<sup>602</sup> Whether Adriaan knew of Lievens because of his published reputation as a court painter in England or through Lievens's Van Dyckian portrait prints, it seems clear that the commission to Lievens arose from Lievens's artistic style and ability as a Van Dyckian portraitist.

Lievens depicted his subjects as dignified, alert and peculiarly engaged with the viewer. In his painting of Sir Rober Kerr (Sum. 1294, 1654, Edinburgh, fig. 180), Lievens captures the sitter's acute focus and interaction with the artist. Kerr's face, contained within his attire and skullcap, with its lowered eyelids and tight-lipped expression, is enlivened by the tufts of hair that swirl about it and the play of light across his angular cheekbone. Kerr recorded his impression of Lievens's self-confidence concerning this portrait, but also noted that he was painter to the court at Berlin. Kerr already owned Lievens's *Capuchin Monk praying* (Sum. 1238, 1629, Monteviot) and as English ambassador to Holland had conveyed Lievens's c. 1628 *Student reading by a Turf Fire* (Sch 116, lost) to Charles I from Frederik Hendrik.<sup>603</sup>

In his painting of the Delft patrician Jacob Junius (Sum. 1295, c. 1655, Milwaukee, fig. 181) Lievens masked the sitter's facial paralysis by a severe yet detached and world-weary deportment. Lievens's painting of the sagacious and refined Anna Schurman suggests a voracious intellectual appetite. Her spread fingers all hold places in

---

<sup>602</sup> The pose does recur in a three-quarter length Lievens portrait of an unidentified gentleman (Sum 2368, c. 1653, Paris, on loan from Port-Royal).

<sup>603</sup> Schneider, 303.

a book, as if she were grasping all its contents at once.<sup>604</sup> Lievens continued to respond to his portrait subjects with incisiveness, great sensitivity and expressive power, just as he had in the case of the portrait of Huygens in c. 1628-29.

Lievens's success in receiving the patronage of the highest levels of Amsterdam society is confirmed by the records of portraits that do not survive, including ones of the burgomasters Andries de Graeff (Sch. 239, lost), Joan Huydecoper Jr. (Sch. 242, lost) and Jan Bicker Gerritsz (Sch. 226) as well as the poet Joost van Vondel (Sch. 269, lost).<sup>605</sup> He was also commissioned to paint full-scale posthumous portraits of the Admiral Maerten Harpertz Tromp (1597-1653) (Sum 1296, after 1653, Amsterdam, fig. 186) and his wife Cornelia Teding van Berckhout (1614-1680) (Sum. 1297, after 1653, Amsterdam).<sup>606</sup> The correspondence of 1663 between Johan de Witt and Lievens concerning the *Statenzaal Mars* additionally discusses a commission for posthumous portraits of De Witt's parents-in-law Jan Gerritsz Bicker and Agneta de Graeff. Lievens revealed in a letter the importance of direct encounter with the sitter to the success of his portraits. In apologizing for a delay in completing these works, Lievens explained:

---

<sup>604</sup> Anna Maria Schurman was versed in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. She cultured a friendship with Gijsbert Voetius at Utrecht's university, the leading theologian of the pietist current in Dutch theology known as the "Nadere reformatie" or continuing Reformation (and nemesis of Descartes). Voetius devised a way for her to attend his colloquiums by shielding her with a screen, making her the first woman to receive education at this level in the Netherlands. By 1643 she had joined the Utrecht painter's guild, however, a phase of her life about which she later expressed regrets. She seems to have destroyed her works when she later joined a sect led by the Swiss theologian Jean Labadie. *Metamorfosen, vier eeuwen afbeeldingen van Anna Maria van Schurman*, exhibition, 't Coopmanshûs, Franeker, January 31-March 20, 2004. [www.coopmanshuis.nl](http://www.coopmanshuis.nl) (Accessed April 12, 2004).

<sup>605</sup> See also Sum. D. 1613, 1657, Haarlem. Although Sumowski follows the traditional identification of the sitter in the Haarlem drawing as the physician and Leiden professor Sylvius de Boë, Gregor J. M. Weber more convincingly identified him as Andries de Graeff. Gregor J. M. Weber, "Dus leeft de dappre Graaf, Zu einem Bildnis Andries de Graeffs von Jan Lievens (1607-1672)," *Oud Holland* 99 (1985): 48.

<sup>606</sup> Lievens made his preparatory drawings before the death of Tromp in 1653. Sumowski, 1979 ff, VI, 3586. Schneider counted six separate versions of the portrait of Tromp, Sch. 265, 265 a-e.

“De redden dat dese konterfeytsels so langh onderhanden syn gebleven syn dese: voor eerst dat ick meer by imaginatie als by voorbeelt heb moeten wercken, en dat ick voor een groot Heer doende was die gaerne dinggen in een open dach in Pleyasant locht en landschap uytgebeeld sach, dat ick vertrouwer also bevonden sal worden.”<sup>607</sup>

(“The reasons that these portraits have taken so long are as follows: I have had to work more from the imagination than from a model, and that I was busy for a great Lord who wanted to see things in an open day in pleasant air and landscape, which I wanted to do properly.”)<sup>608</sup>

In their correspondence, De Witt and Pieter de Graeff discuss the possibility of having other artists complete the job but in the end resolved to wait for Lievens despite his confession to De Graef that “...doch also seyde van deselve sulcke stercke imaginatie niet te hebben” (“... yet about [the porrait of Agneta] he said he did not have such powerful imagination.”). Through their patience, De Witt and De Graeff show their esteem for Lievens, but the passage also reveals the high standards he set for his own work. His intention was to go far beyond simply copying another work, and to achieve the quality derived from direct observation. Lievens would have been forced to rely on his imagination. Lievens’s candor concerning his limitations in this area might seem inconsistent with his oft-evident self-confidence. But as his portraits show, and as Huygens testified concerning the effectiveness of his own portrait by Lievens, personal observation played an unusually important role in Lievens’s portraiture.<sup>609</sup>

---

<sup>607</sup> Jan Lievens to Johan DeWitt, April 24, 1664, in Schneider, 298. Pieter de Graeff to Johan de Witt, April 13, 1663, in Schneider, 296.

<sup>608</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>609</sup> The identity of the great Lord whose commission took precedence over the powerful De Witt and De Graeff is not known. Weber, “*Dus leeft de dappre Graaf*,” 51. Schneider, 296-298.

Lievens was occasionally called on to produce more involved portraits as well. One of the most elaborate portraits in Amsterdam must have been that of the children of Burgomaster Lambert Reynst and Alida Bikker (Sch. 256, c. 1664, lost).<sup>1</sup> One of the three sons was mounted on a horse and one of the two daughters was embroidering a sampler with the following words from Ecclesiastes 11: “In filiis suis agnoscitur vir” (By his children a man is known).<sup>610</sup> This group portrait calls to mind what must have been one of Lievens’s greatest early works, his lost portrait of the children of Charles I, which had been catalogued by Van der Doort and mentioned by Orlers.<sup>611</sup>

### Portrait drawings

Lievens also made a wide range of portrait drawings and prints after 1644, often continuing to use the format of Van Dyck’s *Iconographia*. As with his painted portraits, Lievens’s range of clients extended far beyond artists and collectors to include patricians, scholars, poets and dignitaries. Among the early portrait sitters was René Descartes (1596-1650) (Sum. D 1660x, 1639-49, Groningen, fig. 187), who had lived and worked in Holland for much of his life. The intense controversy that Descartes’s new mechanistic philosophies aroused in Utrecht, and his open letter of 1643 against the counter-Remonstrant theologian Voetius spread controversy all over Holland and had strained Descartes’s dependence on the protection of his friend Constantijn Huygens,

---

<sup>610</sup> Vondel, “Op d’afkomste,” 1664. The portrait must date to 1664 or just thereafter, based on the ages of the children: Elisabeth (1648-1712), Arnoldina (1652-1701), Hendrik (1650-1684), Cornelis (who died in 1673), and Gerard (no dates available). Schneider, 161.

<sup>611</sup> Orlers, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 139. O. Millar, “Abraham Van der Doort’s Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I,” *Proceedings of the Walpole Society* 37 (1958-59): 146, 161.



who could have introduced him to Lievens, and ultimately Frederik Hendrik. He published and worked in freedom but felt the constant threat of censure. The death of Frederik Hendrik in 1647 and the anticipated accession of Willem II to majority and the position of Stadhouder in 1650 likely induced Descartes to leave Holland for Sweden in 1649. Lievens shows Descartes as relaxed, approachable and gesturing as if speaking.<sup>612</sup> The easy rapport between the sitter and viewer recalls Huygens's comment on Lievens's preternatural "acute and profound insight."<sup>613</sup>

The Amsterdam period portrait prints and drawings in black chalk were tremendously rich and varied in their range of elite sitters, and included Dr. Ephraim Bueno (1599-1665) (Holl. 20, c. 1655-66, fig.188), the publisher Cornelis Dirksz Cool (c. 1593-1669) (Sum. D 1603, 1649, Amsterdam, fig. 189), tax collector Joannes Wttenbogaert (1608-1680) (Sum. D 1604, 1650, Amsterdam, fig. 190), the protestant minister Caspar Streso (1603-1664) (Sum D. 1611, c. 1654-58, fig. 191, see Holl. 24), and the poet Jan Vos (1610-1667) (Sum. D 1614, Frankfurt, fig. 194) in addition to the burgomasters De Graaf (Sum. D 1613, c. 1650, Haarlem, fig. 164) and Huydecooper (Sch. 242, 1656-62, lost), the last a portrait praised by the poet Jan Vos.<sup>614</sup>

Far from forming a comprehensive and categorized collection of images of "illustrious men" as Van Dyck had assembled in the *Iconographia*, Lievens made portrait prints on commission as well as for the market, although he certainly capitalized on the

---

<sup>612</sup> Israels, 585-587.

<sup>613</sup> Huygens, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 133.

<sup>614</sup> Joods Historisch Museum Amsterdam, [www.jhm.nl](http://www.jhm.nl) (Accessed August 25, 2005). Jan Vos, *Alle de Gedichten* (Amsterdam: 1662-1671), 147-148, 198.

renown of Van Dyck's prints.<sup>615</sup> Few of Lievens's late portrait drawings show the exaggerated elegance of the English courtier drawings (for example Sum. D. 1645x, Düsseldorf, fig. 86) or the portrait of Adriaan Trip (Sum, 1644, Private Collection, fig. 178). Instead Lievens concentrated on his engagement with the sitter and registering their rapport, which ranged from the apprehension of the Protestant minister Caspar Streso to the bemusement of the poet Jan Vos, Lievens responded sensitively to the tastes of his Amsterdam patrons yet mirrored their confidence and the adventurous spirit of the city at the height of its power. Lievens's rapid entry into the upper echelons of patronage in Amsterdam was due primarily to his stylish portrait manner, but some credit is due Huygens, who was active in Amsterdam intellectual circles and continued to promote Lievens and his work.

### **Vos and Vondel**

During his late period in Amsterdam, Lievens associated with the prominent poet/playwrights Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679) and Jan Vos (c. 1620-1667) (Sum. D 1614, c. 1662, Frankfurt). Vondel was the preeminent poet of the Dutch Golden Age, publishing his authoritative and influential *Aenleidinge ter Nederduitsche dichtkunst* in 1650 as well as his volume *Poezy*, for which Lievens's portrait print (Holl. 21, 1650) served as frontispiece.<sup>616</sup> Vondel was, furthermore, one of the central figures in the

---

<sup>615</sup> Stephanie S. Dickey, "Van Dyck in Holland: The Iconography and its Impact on Rembrandt and Jan Lievens," *Van Dyck 1599-1999: Conjectures and Refutations*, Hans Vlieghe, ed. (Brussels: Brepols, 1999), 299.

<sup>616</sup> Schneider, 267.

“Muiderkring,” the circle of the friends of the poet Peter Cornelisz Hooft (1581-1647) who gathered at Hooft’s castle at Muiden that was his seat and also served as his Arcadian country retreat.<sup>617</sup> Chief amongst this group were Constantijn Huygens and Caspar van Baerle.<sup>618</sup> The efforts of this circle have been characterized by Jonathan Israels as an attempt to wrest cultural initiative in the United Provinces from the grip of the polarized theological debates of the early decades of the century through the introduction of classicism and idealism.<sup>619</sup>

In a poem about Lievens’s frontispiece to the 1650 *Poezy* (Sum. D. 1610, c. 1644-50, Hilversum, fig. 192, and Holl. 21, c. 1650, fig. 193), Vondel expressed his clear understanding of Lievens’s goals and aspirations in portraiture:

“Op [Vondels] Prent  
Door Livius van Leiden  
Geteeckent en gesneden  
zoo volleghet Livius van Leiden Titiaen,  
En leert door zijne kunst u Vondels spraeck verstaen,  
Die’t Grieksch en Roomsche tooneel in Neêrlant  
pooght te stichten  
Men van uit’s Dichters print wat treurspel  
hy wil dichten.”<sup>620</sup>

(“On Vondel’s print by Livius of Leiden, drawn and engraved, so Livius van Leiden succeeds Titian and teaches you through his art to understand Vondel’s words, who strives to establish Greek and Latin theatre in the Netherlands. [One can tell] from the print of the poet what

---

<sup>617</sup> H. W. van Tricht, *Het Leven van P. C. Hooft* (The Hague, 1980), 179-194. L. Strenghoff, “Over de Muiderkring,” [www.dbnl.org](http://www.dbnl.org) (Accessed January 31, 2006).

<sup>618</sup> Van Baerle was portrayed by Jan’s brother, Dirck Lievens, in 1639. Schneider, 278-279.

<sup>619</sup> Jonathan Israels, *The Dutch Republic*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 578 –579.

<sup>620</sup> Joost van de Vondel, “Op [Vondels] Print Door Livius van Leiden Geteeckent en gesneden,” *Poezy* (1650), [www.dbnl.org](http://www.dbnl.org) (Accessed August 27, 2005).

tragedy he intends to write.”)<sup>621</sup>

Vondel introduced Lievens as coming from Leiden (an academic city), and played on the association that Jan Lievens and his brothers Joost (and especially) Titus, had long been fostering between their family name, latinized as Livius, and the Roman historian Titus Livius. By praising Lievens’s ability to teach “Vondels spraeck” (Vondel’s speech) “door zijne kunst” (“through his art”), Vondel enlists Lievens in his own effort to establish Greek- and Roman-style theatre in the Netherlands (“Die’t Grieksch en Roomsche tooneel in Neêrland poght te stichten”), which recall classicising elements of Lievens’s style as well as his many paintings on subjects from classical antiquity.

By suggesting that Lievens was a successor to Titian, Vondel associated Lievens with the foremost model for the greatest court artists Lievens knew: Rubens and Van Dyck. Thus Vondel accurately characterizes the ambitions Lievens pursued his entire life. The restraint, motionlessness and stoic mood of Lievens’s work seem to derive from direct knowledge of Titian’s work and a desire to approximate that painter’s style.

Lievens even derived the composition of his splendid *Self-Portrait* in London from a Titian painting, overtly expressing his admiration for Titian’s art. Lievens neither copied Titian’s paintings, as did Rubens, however, nor is known to have made any sketches after Titian’s work as did Van Dyck. Although Titian’s works were plentiful in London and Flanders, the extent of Lievens’s direct knowledge of Titian’s work still remains unclear.

The *Poezy* frontispiece that was “drawn and engraved” by Lievens (“*Geteeckent en gesneden*”) shows Vondel wearing a skullcap and holding a rolled-up piece of paper

---

<sup>621</sup> Translation mine.

(Holl. 21).<sup>622</sup> In a 1653 poem on another Lievens portrait of him, however, Vondel mentions Lievens showing him wearing a laurel crown,

“Zoo kroont Jan Lievenszoon, de Leidsche Titiaan,  
My op Sint Lukasfeest met Febus Lauwerblaên.  
Het brein is zwanger van een dankgedicht te baaren.  
Maal bij dees krans mijn lier, dan hoort gij Vondels  
snaaren.”<sup>623</sup>

(“Thus Jan Lievens, the Titian of Leiden, crowns me on St. Luke’s day with Phoebus’s laurel leaves. The brain is pregnant, to deliver a poem of gratitude, Paint my lyre too, besides this wreath, then you will hear Vondel’s strings.”)<sup>624</sup>

This image is likely the one recorded in a drawn copy (Sch. Z 76, c. 1653, Haarlem) and a painting by Lievens resembling it formerly in the possession of the painter’s confraternity *Pictura* in The Hague in 1770 (Sch. 269b, lost), in which Vondel also wears a laurel crown.<sup>625</sup> It celebrated Vondel as a participant in the feast of St. Luke on October 20, 1653 known as the “Union of Apollo and Apelles.”<sup>626</sup>

Around 1662 Lievens made a vigorous chalk drawing of the poet Jan Vos (Sum.

---

<sup>622</sup> The print was designed (“delineavit”) by Lievens, but the first publisher (“excudit”) of the fifth state is listed as A. De Wees, an otherwise unknown printmaker. J. F. M. Sterck, “De Portretten van Vondel,” *De Werken van Vondel* IV (Amsterdam: Maatschappij voor Goede en Goedkoope lectuur, 1927-1940), 40-41. A half-length painted portrait (Sch. 269, University of Amsterdam), signed and dated 1660, seems to reproduce Lievens’s etching and may be a copy of it. Schneider, 155, 386, fig. 59. Sum. D 1610, 3588. The most securely attributed portrait drawing by Lievens of Vondel was last known in a private collection (Schn. Z 416a, c. 1654, Hilversum).

<sup>623</sup> Joost van den Vondel, *Gedichten* III (Haarlem, 1751), 143. www.dbnl.org (Accessed Aug 27, 2005)

<sup>624</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>625</sup> Schneider, 155. A portrait of Vondel wearing a laurel wreath in Notre Dame University’s Snite Art Museum was formerly identified with this entry (Sch. 269). Dean A. Porter, “Notre Dame Art Gallery and its Benefactors,” *Art Journal* 32 (1973): 307. On the “Confrerie *Pictura*”, see Buijsen et al, 42-43.

<sup>626</sup> Sterck, 41.

D 1614, Frankfurt, fig. 194).<sup>627</sup> As he did for Vondel, Lievens showed Vos holding a scroll indicating his profession as poet, and Lievens shows his broad, coarse features in a dignified way. Vos praised the drawing,

“Dus maalt my Lievensen,  
om na myn doot te leeven.  
Ik poog de doot vergeefs t’ontvluchten door myn schacht  
‘t penceel is machtig om de verf een ziel te geven.  
Een die de doot verwint, heeft overgroote kracht  
Ik word door Lievens handt onsterfelyk geschaapen”<sup>628</sup>  
De teekenpen verstrekt het leven tot een wapen.<sup>629</sup>

(“Thus Lievens paints me,  
so that I can live after death  
I vainly try to escape death through my quill  
The brush is powerful in giving a soul to [mere] paint  
and the one that conquers death has immense power  
I am made immortal through Lievens’s hand  
the drawing pen serves Life as a weapon”)<sup>630</sup>

The image of art defeating death was drawn from Vos’s *Triumph of Painting*, a long poem commemorating the 1653 feast of the “Brotherhood” of painters and poets.

Unfortunately Lievens was working in Berlin in 1653 and thus absent from the feast that brought together the “Brotherhood,” and therefore left out of the poem.<sup>631</sup>

---

<sup>627</sup> Vos’s earthy and realistic plays and poetry made him, along with Rembrandt, the *bête noir* of Vondel, De Bisschop, Pels and the classicists. Gregor J. M. Weber, *Der Lobtopos des ‘lebenden’ Bildes: Jan Vos und sein “Zeege der Schilderkunst” von 1654* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1991), 17. Although Vos’s work was disdained by Huygens and others for being the words of an uneducated lowly tradesman (he was glazier for the Town Hall), Dudok van Heel has demonstrated that his family roots were in fact distinguished. Sebastian A. C. Dudok van Heel, “Jan Vos (1610-1667),” *Jaarboek Amstelodamum* 72 (1980): 24.

<sup>628</sup> Jan Vos, in Houbraken, in Schneider, 302.

<sup>629</sup> Vos uses the word “maalt” figuratively and later refers to the drawing pen (“teekenpen”) as Lievens’s weapon against mortality in this portrait. Weber, *Lobtopos*, 161.

<sup>630</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>631</sup> In his poem *De Strydt tussen de Doodt en Natuur of de Zeege der Schilderkunst* (1654), Vos only mentioned painters who were actually present at the feast of the “Brotherhood” or “Union between Apollo and Apelles” in Amsterdam on St. Luke’s Day (Oct. 21), 1654. Weber, *Lobtopos*, 39.

In Holland Lievens must have associated with many more artists than his portraits reveal. Besides Jan Miense Molenaer and Judith Leyster, with whom Lievens and his family lived in 1644, Jacob Campo Weyermann reported that Lievens visited Jan Steen “almost daily” from the mid 1660s on.<sup>632</sup> Lievens painted a now-lost and undated portrait of Adriaen Hannemann, who was the most successful follower of Van Dyck in Holland and the only artist who worked with Lievens in the *Statenzaal*.<sup>633</sup> The great range and prestige of Lievens’s portrait sitters after 1644 confirms that Lievens consistently worked for patrons at the highest levels of Dutch society, as the evidence of his patronage for civic works indicates. Never content with a single formula, Lievens adapted the pose, expression and formality to each subject, who he rendered with formidable perception and expression.

### **Landscape paintings and drawings**

Following the court artists Rubens and Van Dyck and the future court painter David Teniers II, Lievens took up a romantic and painterly kind of landscape painting in Flanders, but of the thirteen surviving landscape paintings by Lievens, only three were made after 1644, while he lived mainly in Holland. These are the *Landscape with Road and Church Tower* (Sum 1309, c. 1645, Amsterdam, fig. 195), *Forest Landscape with Hagar and the Angel* (Sum. 1310, c. 1650, Rouen, fig. 196), and *Forest Landscape with*

---

<sup>632</sup> Weyermann, 353. *Jan Steen, Painter and Storyteller*, exh. cat. (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1995), 28, 35 n.60. One record refers to a collaborative work in which Steen added a *Flight into Egypt* to a Lievens landscape (Sch. 27, Dunkirk), but this has not been verified. Schneider, 99.

<sup>633</sup> Lievens seems to have made a portrait drawing of Adriaen Hanneman (Sch. Z 416, formerly Düsseldorf).

*Beggars and Ramblers* (Sum. 1311, c. 1650, Edinburgh, fig. 197). These three continue in the style of his Antwerp-period landscapes and show little of the influence of the paintings of other active Dutch landscape masters. Lievens's Antwerp-period landscape paintings were collected in Amsterdam, notably by Rembrandt who owned two of them in 1656. One of them was likely the one described by Samuel van Hoogstraten:

“’t Gesternt en de Maen geven een bleek en twijfelachtich licht; want schoon de Maen, alsze vol is, de voorwerpen van Bergen en landouwen bescheydelijk genoeg laet zien, wanneerze haer schoone gedaent in een stille stroom afdrukt, zoo bijven nochtans de, andersins genoechlijke, bosschaedjen verschriklijk om aen te zien, en de heuvelen en spelonken zin met vreeslijkheit geverwt. Ik heb een Maneschijn met deze eygensschappen op’t aldernatuurlijkst van Johan Lievens gezien.”<sup>634</sup>

(“The stars and the moon gave a wan and faltering light, since the moon, if full, can give the outlines of mountains and buildings clearly enough, but when her beautiful light steadily decreases there remain the, in other cases still clear, shadows of the trees are frightening to look at and the hills and caves are painted with dreadfulness. I saw a moonlight landscape with these features at their most natural by Jan Lievens.”)<sup>635</sup>

Since Hoogstraten had studied with Rembrandt from 1642-c. 1645, just as Lievens arrived in Amsterdam from Antwerp, the painting he described must be the “manen schijntie” (“moonlight”) listed in Rembrandt’s inventory of 1656 (Sch. 327, lost), which is likely identical with the Berlin *Evening Landscape*.<sup>636</sup>

While Lievens’s three landscape paintings were a minor part of his late oeuvre, his landscape drawings were not. All of the eight-five surviving drawings catalogued by

---

<sup>634</sup> Hoogstraten, 258, in Schneider, 300.

<sup>635</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>636</sup> The support bears an Antwerp panel-makers brand mark. Sum, *Gemälde* III, 1813. Strauss and Van der Meulen, 350 (Nr. 22).



Sumowski belong to this period, and documents indicate that another possible one hundred and six drawings were made. While these landscape drawings may have little to do with Lievens's ambitions as a history painter, they represent his adaptation to the specific market conditions in Amsterdam, and the considerable demand for landscape drawings there. A detailed or complete survey of the landscape drawings falls outside the scope of this study, but a few significant examples and details provide additional insight about his ambition and artistic development.

Lievens's finished landscape drawings are distinct from those by Rembrandt, Ruisdael and other prominent artists working in Amsterdam at the time. Well into the 1660s Lievens's landscape drawings maintain an affinity to the works of Brouwer, Van Dyck, David Teniers II and to Rubens's landscape paintings and drawings. This is evident in the dense foliage, twisting trunks, screens of trees, and the diagonal pen strokes by which Lievens gave movement and atmosphere to his drawings with unfailing self-confidence. The strokes also follow the motion of Lievens's hand and harmonize with the direction of the light in the scene to form a kind of unity between the artist's body and nature itself, enhancing the intense attachment that the artist already shows by wandering about in the world around him.<sup>637</sup> The wanderings the drawing suggest accord with Lievens's roving and transient personality. His perceptive, acquisitive and energetic personality emanate from these sheets with great force.

In one of them, *Wooded Landscape with a Painter at the Easel* (Sum. D. 1691x, c. 1661, Frankfurt, fig. 198), barely noticeable off to the right, Lievens included an artist behind a large canvas on an easel. This seemingly innocuous detail is virtually unique in

---

<sup>637</sup> The use of pen and ink, a favorite of Flemish draftsmen, is inherently more calligraphic and flatter than the more atmospheric media of chalk or brush favored by Ruisdael and Van Goyen.

Dutch art and has forced a reevaluation of Dutch landscape painting in the seventeenth century, since Lievens indicates that an artist painting *en plein air* was something that could be seen in the country.<sup>638</sup> Ironically, Lievens's pen-and-ink landscape drawings were themselves composed in the studio and there is no evidence he himself painted out-of-doors.

In his final letter to Johan De Witt of June 27, 1664, Lievens mentioned a trip to Cleves (“Hoping the improvement/advancement of my Cleves trip, I shall remain my lord’s servant”).<sup>639</sup> Lievens apparently rented a house in Utrecht during this journey east.<sup>640</sup> A small number of the drawings made on this trip survive and some, like *View of the Rhine at Arnhem* (Sch. 194, c. 1663, Paris, fig. 199), show views nearly identical to examples produced by Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (1621-1674) and Jacob Esselins (1626-1687) during the same period that are dated 1663.<sup>641</sup> Eeckhout’s *Sandpit with two sheds near Arnhem or Rhenen*, for example, is nearly identical to a drawing by Lievens (Sum. D 1724, 1663, Paris).<sup>642</sup> The three Amsterdam artists therefore traveled

---

<sup>638</sup> Seymour Slive, *Jacob van Ruisdael: Master of Landscape*, exh. cat. (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2005), 7. Jan Asselijn drew a group of artists working out of doors in Italy, inscribed “Bentveugels” (c. 1640, Berlin). *Masters of Light*, 108.

<sup>639</sup> “Hopende de vordering an myne Cleefsche reys, sal ik blyven UE. Myns Heer dienstwillige...” Jan Lievens to Johan de Witt, June 27, 1664, in Schneider, 300.

<sup>640</sup> An Utrecht surgeon, Dr. Lochon, pawned eleven of Lievens’s paintings to recover part of his housing rent, presumably during this trip. Since Lochon’s claim was to be the first paid out of Lievens’s estate in 1674, it was likely the oldest debt, which confirms that it stemmed back to the 1663 trip. Bredius I, 189.

<sup>641</sup> Esselins’s version is in the Rijksprentenkabinet in Amsterdam, while Eeckhout’s is in the Graphische Sammlung in Munich. Maria van Berge-Gerbaud, *Rembrandt et son école: dessins de la collection Frits Lugt* (Paris: Fondation Custodia, 1997), 199, 206-208. Esselins’s drawing style was very close to that of Lievens and Van Dyck, and he later traveled to England.

<sup>642</sup> Van Berge-Gerbaud, 206-208. Sumowski, *Drawings* 7, 3844.

up the Rhine together in 1663, much like Van Ruisdael and Nicolaes Berchem had done around 1650.<sup>643</sup>

### **The Final Years 1669-1674**

Although Lievens showed considerable vigor in the work of his later years, after 1669 his productivity seems to have dropped off dramatically and almost no work can be dated with certainty to later than 1670. This suggests a physical decline, which is confirmed by Lievens's debt to a Dordrecht physician in 1669, and a large apothecary debt outstanding at his death in 1674.<sup>644</sup> Lievens's second wife Cornelia died around March 20, 1668, which may have hastened his decline.<sup>645</sup> His last documented portrait commission was given in late 1671 but he was unable to finish it.<sup>646</sup> The following year the art market and Dutch economy collapsed following the invasion of Louis XIV and beginning of the Third Anglo-Dutch War of 1672-74.<sup>647</sup>

The inventory taken of Lievens's goods on July 3, 1674 assessed the value of all his goods at a mere two hundred and five guilders and eleven stuivers versus liabilities in

---

<sup>643</sup> Schneider, 300. Eeckhout's drawing is in the Teylers Museum, while Esselens's is in the National Gallery of Scotland in Edinburgh. Van Berge-Gerbaud, 208.

<sup>644</sup> Bredius I, 189, 212.

<sup>645</sup> De Baar, 17. Both the testimony of Jeremias Godijn, of October 1671 and documents in Leiden of August 1672 indicate Lievens falling into debt for basic necessities. Bredius I, 210-212.

<sup>646</sup> Lievens pupil Denys Godijn was ordered to finish the portrait under Lievens's supervision. Bredius I, 210-212. The results of Lievens's claim against the Gecommitteerde Raden, ongoing in December of 1671, is not known but the delay caused him severe difficulties in The Hague. Bredius IV Add., 141.

<sup>647</sup> Martin Jan Bok, "Society, Culture and Collecting in Seventeenth-Century Delft," *Vermeer and the Delft School*, Walter Liedtke, ed., exh. cat. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001), 210.

excess of six thousand guilders, of which five thousand represented Cornelia's estate that was to be left to their five surviving children Augustinus, Frederick Willem, Johannes (sic), Constantinus and Maria.<sup>648</sup> The next largest liability was an 800-guilder loan from Jan Lievens's oldest son Jan Andrea.

Among Lievens's effects, besides the *Triumph of Peace* (Sum. 1207, 1652, Amsterdam) and *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (at four guilders, likely the small version at Castle Howard, Sum. 1195, c. 1636), were a *Deposition* (Sch. 36a, lost), a *Virgin and Child* (Sch. 28a, lost) and numerous other mythological and religious paintings, as well as a few portraits.<sup>649</sup> Of the paintings in his possession, only the *Triumph of Peace* exceeded the twelve guilder value of the mirror that went to the surgeon Lochon. The assessed values are far lower than those of Lievens's work in De Renialme's 1657 inventory and thus generally reflect the collapse of the art market following the *Rampjaar* of 1672.<sup>650</sup>

These circumstances do little to diminish the adventurous sweep of the last thirty years of Lievens's career. From the *Oranjezaal* to the *Rijnlandshuis*, he maintained a series of prestigious commissions, held the respect of his patrons and colleagues and came into contact and was patronized by a great number of the most powerful residents of Amsterdam at the height of its influence in the world. Lievens followed his own ambition in history painting, established and cultured under Lastman in Amsterdam, and he was patronized and aided at many points during his later years by the brilliant Constantijn Huygens. Lievens helped bring Flemish style to Holland after 1644, but used

---

<sup>648</sup> Bredius I, 189.

<sup>649</sup> Bredius I, 187-189.

<sup>650</sup> Of the 18 works by Lievens in the Amsterdam dealer Johannes de Renialme's two inventories (1640 and 1657), eight were assessed over one hundred guilders and only one below twelve guilders. Bredius IV, 228-229.

it to express the dignity and ideals of the Dutch during their Golden Age in the solemn grandeur and triumphant yet reflective mood that are typical of his monumental style. His works that expressed these ideals were placed before the eyes of the most powerful leaders in Holland and seen by them on a daily basis.

## Conclusion

From the beginning of his career to the last works, the search for grandeur and monumentality consistently manifested itself in Jan Lievens's works, a quest to which he applied much experimentation, effort and not inconsiderable talent. His self-confidence, adaptation, absorption and restlessness were symptomatic of this aspiration. Some of his efforts, such as *Lazarus, Abraham and Isaac at the Thank-offering, The Visitation* and *Brinio raised on a Shield*, were startlingly original and enduringly successful contributions to the Dutch Golden Age. Others, on the rank of *Quintus Fabius Maximus* and *The Five Muses*, took their place seamlessly within major decorative projects. Yet others, such as *Mars* (The Hague), remained unresolved and not always thoroughly understood experiments and syntheses whose shortcomings obscured his achievements and blunted the lasting impact of his work and reputation to the present. Ironically, much of his best works, such as his portraits, *tronies* and landscapes, were in genres ancillary (but essential) to his practise and goal of history painting. Lievens's artistic persona mirrored the unstable yet energetic and expansive character of the Dutch Golden Age, whose effective end in 1672 coincided roughly with his own in 1674.

Lievens's critical successes began already with his earliest works of around 1621, which Huygens described as bold, "of inestimable value," "unrivalled artistry," and Orlers as of "consummate skill," and in which he established his independence from his

masters.<sup>651</sup> Writing decades later, the artists Samuel van Hoogstraten and Gerard de Lairesse were equally struck by Lievens's still boldly experimental technique, and Hoogstraten ranked him among the best artists of his age.

As the child of presumably Calvinist Flemish émigrés, Lievens was protected and supported in his early years by the Counter-Remonstrant patrician Jan Orlers. Lievens was nearly unique in giving visual expression to Calvinist teaching in works such as *Feast of Esther* and *Raising of Lazarus*, and the somber monumentality in much of his subsequent work may even be a manifestation of this ethos that persisted even after he converted to Catholicism around 1635-38.

Between 1632 and 1633 Lievens assimilated the style of Van Dyck in England by working in close proximity to the Flemish master in London. This absorbing experience had a lasting impact on his work and style, and led to his development as a religious painter in Flanders and, later, to commissions in Holland. Although his later work is often maligned as stylistically derivative, Lievens's adaptation and absorption of the style and compositions of others was subtle and sophisticated when viewed in the framework of the theories of imitation of his day and served to develop the somber grandeur he pursued in his work in all media. The string of prestigious commissions of his later career is consistent with his earlier critical success and the esteem in which Lievens's colleagues held him.

Lievens's personal restlessness is also seen in the range of styles in which he painted over the years. A review of his late works reveals their unresolved and eclectic character. The more ambitious history paintings of this period, such as *Finding of Erichthonius*, *Mars and Venus* (Berlin), *Moses trampling Pharaoh's Crown* and even

---

<sup>651</sup> Huygens and Orlers, in *Rembrandt and Lievens in Leiden*, 133, 139.

*Mars* can be understood by viewers as less artistically successful than the *tronies* and landscape drawings that he made concurrently. Lievens's artistic struggles are a testament to his over-reaching ambition and unflagging self-confidence, but also to the pitfalls of his practice and lifestyle. His displacements, which succeeded each other with increasing rapidity, had tragic personal consequences, and seem also to have affected his artistic abilities. While the lack of a stable studio location restricted Lievens's ability to maintain pupils, market his work and forge a consistent artistic identity, it did not prevent him from succeeding at his art.

Lievens's importance goes well beyond what he brought to the early development of Rembrandt's style. After they left Lieden, Lievens continued to evolve in his work, assimilating elements of Flemish style and classicism and bringing these to Holland, while maintaining ties to powerful clients and figures, from Constantijn Huygens to Johan DeWitt. His artistic dialogue with other artists, more rich and nuanced than previously allowed, was an essential part of that evolution. His artistic personality reveals itself through his appetite for experience not of his own soul, but for the art and people of the broadening world and dynamic age through which he passed.



## Works Cited

- Alpers, Svetlana. "Manner and Meaning in some Rubens Mythologies." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 (1967): 272-295.
- Angel, Philips. *Lof der Schilderkunst*. Michael Hoyle, trans. *Simiolus* 24 (1996): 227-257.
- Amsterdam, 1907. *Jan Lievens. Tentoonstelling in s'Rijksprentenkabinet te Amsterdam*. Exhibition Catalogue. Amsterdam: Rijksprentenkabinet, 1907.
- Baar, P. J. M. de. *De Leidse Verwanten van Rembrandt van Rijn en hun Leidse Aftstemmingen tot heden*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., rev. Leiden: Gemeentearchief, 1992.
- Baar, P.J.M. de, and Ingrid Moerman, "Rembrandt van Rijn and Jan Lievens, inwoners van Leiden." *Rembrandt & Lievens in Leiden*. Edited by Christiaan Vogelaar. Exhibition Catalogue. Leiden: Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, 1991.
- Bakker, Boudewijn. "Schilderachtig: discussions of a seventeenth-century term and concept." *Simiolus* 23 (1995): 157.
- Baligand, Françoise. *Peinture Hollandaise, Catalogue*. Douai: Musée de la Chartreuse, 1978.
- Bartsch, Adam von. *The Illustrated Bartsch*. New York: Abaris, 1978-.
- Bauch, Kurt. "Rembrandt und Lievens." *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 11 (1939): 239-268.
- "Jan Lievens." *Sitzungsberichte der Kunstgeschichtlichen Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 14 (1965/6).
- "Zum Werk des Jan Lievens." *Pantheon* 25 (1967): 160-170, 259-269.
- Baudouin, Frans. "Van Dyck in the Hague." *Van Dyck 1599 - 1999: Conjectures and Refutations*. Edited by Hans Vlieghe. Brussels: Brepols, 2001.
- Belkin, Kristen Lohse. "Rubens's Latin Inscriptions on his copies after Holbein's *Dance of Death*." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 52 (1989): 245 – 50.
- Benezit, E. *Dictionnaire critique et documentaire des Peintres, sculpteurs, dessinateurs et Graveurs*. Paris: Librairie Gründ, 1960.
- Berge-Gerbaud, Maria van. *Rembrandt et son école: dessins de la collection Frits Lugt*. Paris: Fondation Custodia, 1997.

- Beyers, Holm, ed. *Rembrandt: The Master and his Workshop. Drawings*. Exhibition Catalogue. Berlin: Staatliche Museen, 1991.
- Białostocki, Jan. "Lievens und Rembrandt." *Jan Lievens. Ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*. Edited by Rüdiger Klessmann. Exhibition Catalogue. Braunschweig, 1979: 13-20.
- Biblia dat is De Gantsche H. Schrifture*. 1637, Dordrecht: Pieter Keur, 1719.
- Bie, Cornelis de. *De Gulden Cabinet*. Antwerp: 1661.
- Bikker, Jonathan. "The Deutz brothers, Italian paintings and Michiel Sweerts." *Simiolus* 26 (1998): 286.
- Binstock, Benjamin. *Becoming Rembrandt: National, Religious and Sexual Identity in Rembrandt's History Paintings*. Ph.D diss., Columbia University, 1997.
- Blankert, Albert, ed. *Rembrandt: A Genius and His Impact*. Exhibition Catalogue. Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria, 1997.
- , ed. *Gods, Saints and Heroes. Dutch Painting in the Age of Rembrandt*. Exhibition Catalogue. Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1980.
- , *Kunst als regeringszaak in Amsterdam in de 17e eeuw*, Exhibition Catalogue. Lochem: De Tijdstroom, 1975, 27 – 29.
- Blunt, Anthony. *Art and Architecture in France 1500 – 1700*. London: Penguin, 1953.
- Boston, 1969. *Rembrandt: Experimental Etcher*. Exhibition Catalogue. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1969.
- Büttner, Nils and Ulrich Heinen, eds. *Barocke Leidenschaften*. Exhibition Catalogue. Braunschweig: Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, 2004.
- Blake, Robin. *Van Dyck, a life 1599-1641*. London: Constable, 1991.
- Bode, Wilhelm von. *Adriaen Brouwer, sein Leben, seine Werke*. Berlin: Euphorion, 1924.
- Böhmer, Günter. *Der Landschaftler Adriaen Brouwer*. Munich: Neuer Filser Verlag, 1940.
- Bok, Marten Jan. "Artists at Work: Their Lives and Livelihood." *Masters of Light*.

- Exhibition Catalogue. Edited by Joaneath Spicer. Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1998.
- , "Society, Culture and Collecting in Seventeenth-Century Delft." *Vermeer and the Delft School*, Exhibition Catalogue. Edited by Walter Liedtke. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001.
- Bork, G. J. van and P. J. Verkruijsse. *De Nederlandse en Vlaamse auteurs*. Weesp: De Haan, 1985.
- Boschloo, A.W.A. *Annibale Carracci in Bologna*. The Hague: Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Branden, F. Joseph van den. *Geschiedenis van de Antwerpsche Schilderschool*. Antwerp: J.-E. Buschmann, 1883.
- Braun, Hermann. *Gerard und Willem van Honthorst*. Ph.D. diss. Universität Göttingen, 1966.
- Klessmann, Rüdiger, ed. *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*. Exhibition Catalogue. Braunschweig: Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, 1979.
- Bredius, A. *Künstler-Inventäre: Urkunden zur Geschichte der holländischen Kunst des XVIten, XVIIten und XVIIIten Jahrhunderts*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1915-22.
- Brière-Misme, Clotilde. "Le portrait de Constantin Huyghens." *Bulletin des Musées de France* 9 (1937): 28-30.
- Brown, Christopher. Review of *Jan Lievens. Ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*. Exhibition. Braunschweig: Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, 1979. *Burlington Magazine* 121 (1980): 742.
- , "Jan Lievens in Leiden and London." *Burlington Magazine* 125 (1983): 663-671.
- , ed. *Rembrandt: The Master and his Workshop. Paintings*. Exhibition Catalogue. Berlin: Staatliche Museen, 1991.
- Bruyn, Joshua, Bob Haak, Simon H. Levie, P. J. J. van Thiel, Ernst van de Wetering, eds. *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982-.
- Bruyn Kops, C.J. de. "De Friese stadhouder Hendrick Casimir I getekend door Jan Lievens." *Oud Holland* 85 (1970): 128-132.
- Buchelius, Arnoldus. "*Res Pictoriae*" *Aantekeningen over Kuntenaers en Kunstwerken*

- (1583-1639). Edited by G.J. Hogewerff and J.Q. van Regteren Altena, eds. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1928, 49.
- Buijsen, Edwin. *Haagse Schilders in de Gouden Eeuw*. The Hague: Hoogsteder and Hoogsteder, 1998.
- Burchard, Ludwig. "Rubens's 'Daughters of Cecrops'." *Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin* XI (1953): 4-27.
- Buvelot, Quentin and Hans Buijs. *A Choice Collection of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Paintings from the Frits Lugt Collection*. The Hague: Mauritshuis, 2003.
- Chapman, H. Perry and Jorge Wadum. "Rembrandt under the Skin. The Mauritshuis *Portrait of Rembrandt with Gorget* in Retrospect." *Oud Holland* 114 (2000): 164-187.
- Chicago, 1969. *Rembrandt after three hundred years*. Exhibition Catalogue. Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 1969.
- Clippel, Karolien de. "Adriaen Brouwer, portrait painter: new identifications and an iconographic novelty." *Oud Holland* 117 (2004): 196-215.
- Colins Baker, C. H. *Catalogue of the Pictures at Hampton Court*. Glasgow: University Press, 1929.
- Carroll, Margaret Deutsch. "Civic Ideology and its Subversion: Rembrandt's *Oath of Claudius Civilis*." *Art History* 9 (1986): 15-17.
- DeLairesse, Gerard. *Groot Schilderboek*. Amsterdam: 1707.
- Delenda, Odile. *L'Iconographie de Sainte Madeleine après le Concile de Trente*. Ph.D diss., Paris, 1984.
- Denucé, Jean. *Art-Export in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century in Antwerp, The Firm Fourchoudt*. Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1931.
- *De Antwerpsche Konstkamers*. Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1932.
- Depauw, Carl, and Ger Luijten. *Anthony Van Dyck as Printmaker*, Exhibition Catalogue. Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1999.
- Descamps, Jean-Baptiste. *Les Vies des Peintres Flamands, Allemand et Hollandois*. Paris: 1754.
- *Voyage Pittoresque de la Flandre et du Brabant, avec des réflexions relativement aux Arts et quelques gravures*. Paris: 1769.

- Deursen, Arie Theo van. *Bavianen en Slijkgeuzen*. 1974, Franeker: van Wijnen, 1991.
- De Witt, David A. "A Scene from Cervantes in the Stadholder's Collection: Lievens's *Gypsy Fortune-Teller*." *Oud Holland* 113 (1999): 181-186.
- Dickie, Stephanie. "Van Dyck in Holland: the *Iconography* and its Impact on Rembrandt and Jan Lievens." *Van Dyck 1599-1641: Conjectures and Refutations*. Brussels: 2001.
- Dudok van Heel, Sebastian A. C. "Jan Vos (1610-1667)." *Jaarboek Amstelodamum* 72 (1980): 2-43.
- Dyck ,Anthony Van, *Icones Principum Virorum Doctorum Pictorum Chalcographorum Statuorum nec non Amatorum Pictoria Artis Numero Cento*. Antwerp: 1645 or 1646.
- Lurie, Doron J. *Jan Lievens: The Sacrifice of Isaac*, Exhibition Catalogue. Tel Aviv: Museum of Art, 1998.
- Ekkart, R.E.O. "Lievens als Zeichner." *Jan Lievens. Ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*. Rüdiger Klessman. Exhibition Catalogue. Braunschweig: Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, 1979.
- Ekkart, R.E.O. et al, *Geschildert te Leiden Anno 1626*. Exhibition Catalogue. Leiden, 1976.
- Emmens, J.A. *Rembrandt en de regels van de kunst*. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1968.
- , "A Seventeenth-Century Theory of Art. Nature and Practice." *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*. Edited by Wayne Franits. 1969, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- , "Ay Rembrandt, maal Cornelis stem." *Kunsthistorisch Opstellen* I. 1956, Amsterdam: G.A. van Oorscot, 1981.
- Erasmus, *Adagiorum Chiliades sive Adagia*. Leiden: 1708.
- Evelyn, John. *Diary 1620-1706*. Akron OH: Harry Dunn, 1901.
- Fock, C. Willemijn. *Het Rapenburg. Geschiedenis van een Leidse gracht*. Leiden: Afdeling Geschiedenis van de Kunstnijverheid Rijksuniversiteit, 1986-.
- Foucart, Jacques. *Trésors des Musées du Nord de la France* I. Exhibition Catalogue. Lille: Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lille, 1972.

- . *Peintures Rembrandtesques au Louvre*. Paris: Musée du Louvre, 1988.
- . "Le tableau du mois no. 42: Le Jeune Dessinateur de Jan Lievens et non de Wallerand Vaillant." *Le Tableau du mois no. 1 à 50 – 1993-1998*. Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2000.
- Franeker, 2004. *Metamorfosen, vier eeuwen afbeeldingen van Anna Maria van Schurman*. Exhibition Website. Franeker: 't Coopmanshûs, 2004. [www.coopmanshuis.nl](http://www.coopmanshuis.nl) (Accessed April 12, 2004).
- Fremantle, Katherine. *The Baroque Town Hall of Amsterdam*. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1959.
- Gaskell, Ivan. "Transformations of Cervantes's 'La Gitanilla' in Dutch Art." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 45 (1982): 263-270.
- . *The Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection: Seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish Painting*. London: Philip Wilson, 1989.
- Gelder, J. G. van. "De Schilders van de Oranjezaal." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* II (1948/49): 118-163.
- Georgievska-Shine, Aneta. "From Ovid's Cecrops to Rubens's City of God in *The Finding of Erichthonius*." *Art Bulletin* 86 (2004): 58-74.
- Gerson, Horst. *Rembrandt. The complete edition of the Paintings by A. Bredius*. London: Phaidon, 1969.
- . *Seven Letters by Rembrandt*. Translated by Yda D. Ovink. The Hague: L. J. C. Boucher, 1961.
- Gifford, Melanie. "The Lute Player by Jan Lievens: Technical and Stylistic Study." *American Institute for Conservation of Historical and Artistic Works, Preprints of Presentations at Annual Meeting, Washington D.C. 1985. A.I.C. News* 10 (1985): 58-67
- Giltaij, Jeroen, ed. *Senses and Sins*. Exhibition Catalogue. Rotterdam: Museum Boymans van Beuningen, 2004.
- Glück, Gustav. *Die Landschaften von Peter Paul Rubens*. Vienna: Anton Schroll, 1945.
- Goossens, Eymert-Jan. *Treasure wrought by chisel and brush*. Zwolle: Waanders, 1996.
- Gordenker, Emilie E. S. *Anthony Van Dyck (1599-1641) and the Representation of Dress in Seventeenth-Century Portraiture*. Brussels: Brepols, 2001.

- Gray, John M. *Notes on the art treasures at New-Battle Abbey*. Midlothian: 1887.
- Gudlaugsson, Sturla J. "Jan Andrea Lievens als Schilder van Ruitersportretten." *Oud Holland* LXV (1950): 123-124.
- Guratzsch, Herwig. *Die Auferweckung des Lazarus in der niederländischen Kunst von 1400 bis 1700. Ikonographie und Ikonologie*. Kortrijk: Van Ghemert, 1980.
- Gutbrod, Helga. *Lievens und Rembrandt. Studien zum Verhältnis ihrer Kunst*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Haak, Bob. *Rembrandt, zijn leven, zijn werk, zijn tijd*. New York: Abrams, 1969.
- *The Golden Age*. New York: Abrams, 1984.
- Halewood, W. H. *Six Subjects of Reformation Art. A Preface to Rembrandt*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Hearn, Karen. "The English career of Cornelius Johnson." *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 22 (2003): 113-129.
- Held, Julius S. "Constantijn Huyghens and Susannah van Baerle: A Hitherto Unknown Portrait." *Art Bulletin* 73 (1991): 653-668.
- Hind, A.M. "The Woodcut Prints of Jan Lievens and Dirk de Bray." *The Imprint* (1914): 233-239.
- Hofrichter, Frima Fox. *Judith Leyster: A Woman Painter in Holland's Golden Age*. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1989.
- Hofstede de Groot, Cornelius. *A catalogue raisonné of the works of the most eminent Dutch painters of the Seventeenth Century based on the work of John Smith*. London: Macmillan, 1907-1927.
- Holbein, Hans. *The Dance of Death*. 1638, London: Dover Edition, 1971.
- Hollstein, F.W.H. *Dutch and Flemish etchings, engravings and woodcuts c. 1450-1700*, XI. Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1955-.
- Hoogstraten, Samuel van. *Inleyding tot de Hooge Schoole de Schilderkonst; anders de Zichtbare Werelt*. Rotterdam, 1678.
- Howarth, David. *Lord Arundel and his circle*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- David Howarth, ed. *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts. Essays in Honor of Sir Olivar Millar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

- Houbraken, Arnold. *De Grootte Schouburgh der Nederlandse Konstchilders en Schilderessen*. Amsterdam, 1718-1721.
- Huygens, Constantijn. *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huygens door hemzelf beschreven*. Translated by A.H. Kan. Rotterdam: Ad. Donker, 1971.
- Isager, Jacob. *Pliny on Art and Society: The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. Ph.D. diss, Odense University, 1990.
- Israel, Jonathan. *The Dutch Republic. It's rise, its greatness and fall 1477 – 1806*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1995.
- Jacob, Sabine. "Zur Entwicklung der Landschaftsmalerei von Jan Lievens." *Jan Lievens. Ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts*. Edited by Rüdiger Klessmann, Exhibition Catalogue. Braunschweig: Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, 1979.
- Jacobs, Fred. "Jacques Gaultier, 'koninklijk' luitspeler." *Kroniek van de Rembrandthuis* (2001): 25.
- James, Susan. "The Model as Catalyst, Nicolas Lanier and Margaret Lemon." *Jaarboek van het Koninklijke Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerpen* (1999): 71, 79.
- Janssen, Paul Huys. *The Hoogsteder Exhibition of Rembrandt's Academy*. The Hague: Hoogsteder and Hoogsteder, 1992.
- Janson, Horst W. "The Putto with the Death's Head." *Art Bulletin* 19 (1937): 423-449.
- Josephus, Flavius. *The Works of Josephus, complete and unabridged*. trans. William Whiston. Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1987.
- Judson, J. Richard, *Gerrit van Honthorst: A Discussion of His Position in Dutch Art*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1959.
- Kahr, Madlyn Millner. "Rembrandt and Delilah." *Art Bulletin* 55 (1972): 240-259.
- "Delilah," *Art Bulletin* 54 (1972): 82-99.
- Keblusek, Marika, and Jori Zijlmans, eds. *Princely Display, The court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms in The Hague*. Exhibition Catalogue. The Hague: Haags Historisch Museum, 1997.
- Klinge, Margret. *David Teniers de Jonge: Schilderijen, Tekeningen*, Exhibition Catalogue. Antwerp: Koninklijke Museum voor Schone Kunsten, 1991.
- , Conrad Renger. *Adriaen Brouwer, David Teniers the Younger*.



- Exhibition Catalogue. London: Noortman and Brod, 1982.
- Knuttel, Gerard. *Adriaen Brouwer, the Master and his Work*. The Hague: Boucher, 1962.
- Kren, Thomas. "Chi non vuol Baccho: Roeland van Laer's burlesque painting about Dutch artists in Rome." *Simiolus* 11 (1980): 63-77.
- Kuile, Onno ter. *Adriaen Hanneman 1604-1671, een Haags portretschilder*. Alphen-on-the-Rijn: Canaletto, 1976.
- Landsberger, Franz. "Rembrandt and Josephus." *Art Bulletin* 36 (1953): 62-63.
- Larsen, Eric. "Brouwer ou Lievens. Étude d'un problème dans le paysage flamand." *Revue Belge d'Archeologie et d'Histoire d'art* 29 (1960): 37-44.
- . *The Paintings of Anthony van Dyck*. Freren: Luca Verlag, 1988.
- . "Der Musiker Jacques Gaultier. Zu einem wiedergefundenen Gemälde Antonis Van Dycks." *Weltkunst* 67 (1997): 700-701.
- Leerintveld, A.M.Th. "'Tquam soo wel te pass': Huyghens portretbijschriften en de datering van zijn portret geschilderd door Jan Lievens." *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek VIII* (1990): 159-184.
- Legrand, F.C. *Les Peintres flamands de genre au xviiie siècle*. Brussels: Meddens, 1963.
- Liedtke, Walter, ed. *Vermeer and the Delft School*. Exhibition Catalogue. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001.
- . *Flemish Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1984.
- Lymant, Brigitte. "Sic Transit Gloria Mundi. Ein Glasgemälde mit Seifenblasen als Vanitassymbol im Schnütgen-Museum." *Wallraff-Richartz Jahrbuch XCII* (1981): 121.
- . *Den grondt der edel vry schilder-const*. Edited by trans. Hessel Miedema. 1604, Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1973.
- Stainton, Lindsay, and Christopher White, *Drawing in England from Hilliard to Hogarth*. Exhibition Catalogue. London: British Museum, 1987.
- The Late King's Goods*. Edited by Arthur MacGregor. London: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Magurn, Ruth Saunders. *The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens*. Cambridge: Harvard

- University Press, 1955.
- Mander, Karel van. *Den Grondt der edel vry schilder-const.* Hessel Miedema, trans. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1973.
- . *Het Schilder-Boeck.* 1604, Utrecht: Davaco, 1969.
- Manuth, Volker. "Denomination and Iconography: The Choice of Subject Matter in the Biblical Painting of the Rembrandt Circle." *Simiolus* 22 (1992-94): 235-252.
- Maximus, Valerius. *Nine Books of Memorable Deeds and Sayings.* Edited and translated by D.R. Shackleton Baily. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Meijer, Bert W. "Italian Paintings in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Holland." *L'Europa e l'arte italiana,* Edited by Max Seidel. Venice: Marsilio, 2000.
- Melion, Walter S. *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Meyers, Mary L. "Rubens and the Woodcuts of Christoffel Jegher." *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* XXV (1966): 7-23.
- Miedema, Hessel. "Philips Angels *Lof der Schilder-konst.*" *Oud Holland* 103 (1989): 181-222.
- Mieris, Frans van, Daniel van Alphen, *Beschrijving der Stad Leyden II,* Leiden: 1670.
- Millar, Olivar. *Van Dyck in England.* Exhibition Catalogue. London: National Portrait Gallery, 1982.
- . "Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I." *Proceedings of the Walpole Society* 37 (1958-59).
- Moes, E.W. "Jan Lievens." *Leids Jaarboekje* 4 (1907): 136-164.
- Moltke, J. W. Von. *Govaert Flinck 1615-1660.* Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1963.
- Nichols, Lawrence W. "Job in distress, a newly-discovered painting by Hendrick Goltzius." *Simiolus* 13 (1983): 182-188.
- Nieuwen Ieuchtspieghel.* Amsterdam: 1617.
- Oldenbourg, Rudolf. *Peter Paul Rubens.* Berlin: Klassiker der Kunst, 1927.
- Omer, Mordechai. "Turner's Biblical Deluge and the iconography of 'homo bulla'." *Comparative Criticism Volume 5, Hermeneutic Criticism.* Edited by E.S. Shaffer.

- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Orlers, Jan Jansz. *Waerachtige beschryvinge en afbeeldinghe van alle de overwinningen*. Second edition. Leiden: 1619.
- Orlers, Jan Jansz. *Beschrijvinge der Stadt Leyden*. Leiden, 1641.
- Ottenheim, K. A. "De Zaal van de Staten van Holland." In *Eerste Kamer: Reflecties over de Vergaderzaal van de "Chambre de Réflexion."* The Hague: SDU Uitgeverij, 1994.
- Page, Nick. *Lord Minimus: The extraordinary life of Britain's smallest man*. New York: St. Martin's, 2001.
- Peacock, John. "Looking at Van Dyck's *Scipio* in its Contexts." *Art History* 23 (2000): 262-289.
- Pelt, R.J. van and M. E. Tiethoff-Spliethoff. *Het Binnenhof van Grafelijk Residentie tot Regeringscentrum*. Dieren: Bataafsche Leeuw, 1984.
- Peter-Raupp, Hanna. *Die Ikonographie des Oranjezaal*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1980.
- Pigler, Andor. *Barokthemen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974.
- Piot, M. Ch. "Les Tableaux des collèges des Jésuites supprimés en Belgique." *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique* 57 (1878): 139-153.
- Ploeg, Peter van der, Epcó Runia, Ariane van Suchtelen. *Dutch and Flemish Masters from the Kremer Collection*. Amsterdam: Foundation Aetas Aurea, 2003.
- Ploeg, Peter van der and Carola Vermeeren. *Princely Patrons, The collection of Frederick Henry and Amalia of Solms*. Exhibition Catalogue. The Hague: Mauritshuis, 1997.
- Plomp, Michiel. "'Een merkwaardige versameling Teekeningen' door Leonaert Bramer." *Oud Holland* 100 (1986): 81-150.
- Quednau, Rolf. "Zu einem Porträt von Jan Lievens." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 43 (1980): 97-104.
- Raay, S. B., W. P. Spies, R. van Zoest. *Tot hun Contenement gemaect' Het Kunstbezit van het Hoogheemraadschap van Rijnland*. Leiden: De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1987.
- Rand, Richard. *The Raising of Lazarus by Rembrandt*. Exhibition Catalogue. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Country Museum of Art, 1991

- Raupp, Hans-Joachim. *Untersuchungen zu Künstlerbildnis und Künstlerdarstellung in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhunderts*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1984.
- Reynolds, E. J. *Some Brouwer Problems*. Lausanne: Charles Bonnard, 1931.
- Rombouts, Phillip, and Théodore van Lieris. *De Liggeren en andere historische archieven van de Antwerpsche Sint Lucasgilde*. Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1961.
- Royalton-Kisch, Martin. "Rembrandt's Drawing of the *Entombment of Christ over The Raising of Lazarus*." *Master Drawings* 29 (1991): 263-283
- . Review of *Rembrandt et son École. Dessins de la collection Fritz Lugt*. Exhibition Catalogue. Paris: Institut Néerlandais, 1997, in *Burlington Magazine* 140 (1998): 621.
- . *The Light of Nature: Landscape drawings and watercolours by Van Dyck and his contemporaries*. Exhibition Catalogue. London: British Museum, 1999.
- Salerno, Luigi. "Due momenti signolari di Salvator Rosa." *Artibus et Historiae* 23 (1991): 121-128.
- Sandrart, Joachim von. *Teutsche Academie des Bau-, Bild- under Mahlerey-Künste*. Nuremberg: 1675-80.
- Saxl, Fritz. "Rembrandt und Italien." *Oud Holland* 41 (1923/1924).
- Saxton, Juliette-Jo. "Lievens, 'Death and the Card Players.'" *Print Quarterly* 11 (1994): 424.
- Schatborn, Peter, ed. *Jan Lievens 1606-1674. Prenten & Tekeningen*. Exhibition Catalogue. Amsterdam: Rembrandthuis, 1988.
- Schendel, A. van. "Het portret van Constantijn Huygens door Jan Lievens." *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* 11 (1963): 5-10.
- Schnackenburg, Bernard. "Knabe im Atelier und Bücherstalleben, zwie frühe Gemälde von Jan Lievens und ihr Leidener Kontext; Rembrandt, Jan Davdisz. de Heem, Pieter Codde." *Oud Holland* 117 (2004): 35.
- Schnackenburg, Bernard, and Ernst van de Wetering, eds. *The Mystery of the Young Rembrandt*. Exhibition Catalogue. Kassel: Staatliche Museen, 2001.
- Schneider, Cynthia P. *Rembrandt's Landscapes*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

- Schneider, Hans. *Jan Lievens. Sein Leben und Seine Werke, mit einem Supplement von R.E.O. Ekkart*. Amsterdam: B.M. Israel, 1973.
- Slive, Seymour. *Rembrandt and his Critics*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1953.
- , *Jacob van Ruisdael: Master of Landscape*. Exhibition Catalogue. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2006.
- Slothouwer, D.F. *De Paleizen van Frederick Hendrick*. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1945.
- Sluiter, Eric Jan. *De lof der schilderkunst. Over schilderijen van Gerrit Dou (1613-1675) en een traktaat van Philips Angel uit 1642*. Hilversum: Verloren, 1993.
- , "Rembrandt's Bathsheba and the Conventions of a Seductive Theme," *Bathsheba Reading King David's Letter*. Edited by Ann Jensen Adams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Smith, John A. *Catalogue raisonné of the Works of the Most Imminent Dutch, Flemish and French Painters*. London: 1829-1842.
- Spicer, Joaneath, ed. *Masters of Light, Dutch Painters in Utrecht in the Golden Age*. Exhibition Catalogue. Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1997.
- Stechow, Wolfgang. "Homo Bulla." *Art Bulletin* 20 (1938): 227-228.
- Stewart, J. Douglas. "Before Rembrandt's 'shadow' fell. Lievens, van Dyck and Rubens. Some Reconsiderations." *Hoogsteder Mercury* 11 (1990): 42-47.
- , "'Crossing the North-South Divide': The Young Lievens, Van Dyck, Rubens and Rembrandt; Connections and Influences." *Collected opinions. Essays on Netherlandish Art in Honour of Alfred Bader*. Edited by Volker Manuth and Axel Rüger. London: Paul Holbertson, 2004.
- Straten, Roelof van. *Rembrandt's Leidse Tijd*  
[www.foleorpublishers.com/rembrnl.htm](http://www.foleorpublishers.com/rembrnl.htm) (Accessed June 24, 2004).
- Strenght, L. *Constanter: Het leven van Constantijn Huygens*. Amsterdam: Querido, 1987.
- Strauss, Walter L. and Marjon van der Meulen. *The Rembrandt Documents*. New York: Abaris, 1979.
- Sumowski, Werner. "Observations on Jan Lievens's Landscape Drawings." *Master Drawings* 18 (1980): 370-372.

- . Review of *Jan Lievens, ein Maler im Schatten Rembrandts* in Braunschweig. *Kunstchronik* 33 (1980): 9.
- . *Die Gemälde der Rembrandt-Schüler*, 6 Vols. Landau/Pfalz: Pfälzische Verlagsanstalt, 1982-1990.
- . *The Drawings of the Rembrandt School*. New York: Abaris, 1979-1985.
- Sutton, Peter. "The *Continnence of Scipio* by Gerbrandt van den Eeckhout (1621 – 1674)." *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Museum of Art* 78 (1982): 3-19.
- . *Northern European Paintings in the Collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1990.
- Swillens, P.T.A. *Jacob van Campen: Schilder en Bouwmeester 1595 – 1657*. 1960, Arnhem: Gysbers & Van Loon, 1979.
- . "Rooms-Katholieke kunstenaars in de 17e eeuw." *Katholiek cultureel tijdschrift* I (1946): 416-419.
- Tacitus, Cornelius. *The Complete works of Tacitus*. trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb. New York: Modern Library, 1942.
- Terrien, Samuel. *The Iconography of JOB through the Centuries*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.
- Tümpel, Astrid. *The Pre-Rembrandtists*. Sacramento: Crocker Art Gallery, 1974.
- Turner, Jane, ed. *Grove Dictionary of Art: From Rembrandt to Vermeer*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000.
- Vertue, George. *Anecdotes of Painting in England with some account of the principal artists*. Edited by Horace Walpole. 1762, London: 1828.
- Virgilius, Publius Maro. *Aeneid, the original Latin text with an interlinear English translation*. Translated by Frederick Holland Dewey. New York: Translation Publishing, 1917.
- Vogelaar, Christiaan, ed. *Rembrandt & Lievens. "Een jong en edel schildersduo."* Exhibition Catalogue. Leiden: Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, 1991.
- Vos, Jan. *Alle de Gedichten*. Amsterdam: 1662.
- Vries, Lyckle de. "Tronies and other single-figures Netherlandish paintings." *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 8 (1990): 190.

- Walsh, Amy. "Van Dyck at the Court of Frederik Hendrik." *Studies in the History of Art* 44 (1994): 222-244.
- Walsh, John. *Jan Steen. The Drawing Lesson*. Los Angeles: J. P. Getty Museum, 1996.
- Warsaw, 1956. *Rembrandt I Jego Krag*. Exhibition Catalogue. Warsaw: Muzeum Narodowe, 1956.
- Weber, Gregor J. M. *Der Lobtopos des 'lebenden' Bildes: Jan Vos und sein "Zeege der Schilderkunst" von 1654*. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag, 1991
- . "Jan Lievens's *The Shield-Raising of Brinio - A Second Oil Sketch*." *Hoogsteder Mercury* 13/14 (1992): 44-50.
- . "Dus leeft de dappre Graaf," Zu einem Bildnis Andries de Graeffs von Jan Lievens (1607 – 1672)." *Oud Holland* 99 (1985): 44 – 56.
- Weller, Dennis. *Sinners and Saints, Darkness and Light*. Exhibition Catalogue. Raleigh: North Carolina Museum of Art, 1998.
- Wetering, Ernst van de. *Rembrandt, the Painter at Work*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- . "The Symbiosis of Lievens and Rembrandt." *Jan Lievens, The Sacrifice of Isaac*, Exhibition Catalogue. 1991, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Museum of Art, 1999.
- Weyerman, Jacob Campo. *De levensbeschryvingen der Nederlandsche Kunstschilders*. The Hague: 1729 – 1769.
- Wheelock, Arthur. K. *The Golden Age of Dutch and Flemish Painting: The Edward and Sally Speelman Collection*. Houston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2000.
- . "Rembrandt Self-Portraits: The Creation of a Myth." *Rembrandt, Rubens and the art of their time; Recent perspectives*. Edited by Roland E. Fleischer and Susan Clare Scott. University Park PA: Penn State, 1997.
- . *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century*. Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1995.
- , ed. *Anthony van Dyck*. Exhibition Catalogue. Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990.
- Wilmers, Gertrude. *Cornelis Schut (1597-1655). A Flemish Painter of the High Baroque*. Brussels: Brepols, 1996.

- Wishnevsky, Rose. *Studien zum "Portrait Histori e" in den Niederlande*. Ph.D. diss, Universit t Munich, 1967.
- Wit, Jacobus de. *De kerken van Antwerpen*. 1774, Antwerp: Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1910.
- Wood, Jeremy. "Orazio Gentileschi and some Netherlandish artists in London." *Simiolus* 28 (2000/2001): 107.
- Worp, J. A. *De briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens (1608-1687)*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1911-1917.
- . *De Gedichten van Constantijn Huygens*. Groningen, 1892-1899.
- Wurfbaun, Maarten. "The Soothsayer by Jan Lievens in Berlin: An Attempt at an Interpretation." *Rembrandt, Rubens and the art of their time: Recent Perspectives*. Edited by R. E. Fleischer and S.C. Scott. University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.
- , ed. *Geschildert tot Leiden anno 1626*. Exhibition Catalogue. Leiden: Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, 1976.
- Zell, Michael. *Rereading Rembrandt: Jews and the Christian Image in Seventeenth-century Amsterdam*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002.